FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-181
Tuesday
18 September 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-181 CONTENTS *18 September 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Vladimir Bogachev on Nuclear Weapons in Europe *[TASS]* 1
Ladygin Interviewed on Geneva Talks, 'Open Skies' *[IAN]* 1
Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Held in Geneva *[Moscow TV]* 3
  Petrovskiy on Treaty Review *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Former KGB Official on Czech's U.S. Contacts *[Prague CTK]* 5
Shevardnadze, Genscher Speak on Treaty With Germany *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 5
Shevardnadze, Dumas Meeting Reported *[IZVESTIYA 14 Sep]* 5
Portugalov on International Role of Germany *[Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG 16 Sep]* 6
Aleksandr Bovin on Impact of 'New Germany' *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 6
TASS Observer Reflects on Treaty With Germany 7
'International Panorama' on Two-Plus-Four Talks *[Moscow TV]* 8
Yazov, Shlyaga Greet International Film Festival *[KRASNAYA ZVEDA 15 Sep]* 9
Comparison of Gorbachev Meeting With Genscher 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Former President Reagan Arrives for Visit 16 Sep 10
  Sobchak Greets Reagans *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Sep]* 10
  Met by Medvedev in Moscow *[PRAVDA 17 Sep]* 10
  Reagan Meets With Gorbachev 17 Sep *[TASS]* 10
  Holds Talks With Lukyanov *[TASS]* 10
Ryzhkov Scheduled To Address U.S., Soviet Lawyers *[TASS]* 11

China

Chinese Communist Party Member Arrives in Moscow *[TASS]* 11
New Ambassador Appointed to China 14 Sep *[TASS]* 11
Business Cooperation Contracts Signed in Beijing *[TASS]* 11
Trade, Industry Exhibition in Beijing Ends *[TASS]* 12

Northeast Asia

RSFSR Minister Receives Mongolian Official *[TASS]* 12
New Mongolian President Ochirbat Profiled *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 12
Shevardnadze's Visit to DPRK Examined *[Moscow International]* 13
Japanese Officials' Visit to DPRK Previewed *[Moscow International]* 13
Yazov Meets With Japanese Journalists *[TASS]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Talks on U.S.-Philippines Bases Previewed *[Moscow International]* 14

Near East & South Asia

Saudi Foreign Minister Continues Visit 15
    Meets With Gorbachev 17 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 15
    Confers With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 15
    Announces Resumption of Ties *[Riyadh TV]* 16
    Meets With Primakov on Gulf *[TASS]* 16
    Sees 'Positive' Soviet Role *[TASS]* 17
    Gulf Crisis as 'Turning Point' *[Moscow International]* 17
Foreign Ministry Consultations Held With Israel *[TASS]* 17
Deputy Foreign Minister Arrives in Tehran *[TASS]* 17
Commentaries Review, Assess Persian Gulf Crisis 18
    Eyewitness Account in Kuwait *[SOBESEDNIK No 36]* 18
    Dangers of Buildup Seen *[Moscow Radio]* 20
    Opposition to Iraq 'Unshakable' *[TASS]* 20
    Iraq Seen as 'Hostage to Events' *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 21
Claims of Nuclear Submarine for India Refuted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Sep]* 23

East Europe

CSFR Deputy Premier Arrives for Trade Talks *[Prague CTK]* 23
Lithuanian Prime Minister Visits CSFR 24
    Seeks To Establish Ties *[Prague TV]* 24
    Joint Trade Agreement Signed *[Vilnius Radio]* 24
Hungarian President Sends Message to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 24

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Message to British Conference *[TASS]* 24
Latvian, Danish Shipping Lines Form Joint Company *[TASS]* 25
Azerbaijani Premier's Visit to Turkey Noted *[cross-reference]* 25

Latin America & Caribbean

State of Chernobyl Victims in Cuba Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Sep]* 25
Cuban Leader on Fuel Problem, Economy *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Cuban Paper's Attack on IVZESTIYA Item Countered *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* 27
RSFSR, Cuba Sign Health Cooperation Pact *[TASS]* 27
New Ambassador to Argentina Appointed *[TASS]* 28
Honduras To Establish Diplomatic Ties *[Moscow Radio]* 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Discusses Market at 17 Sep Proceedings 29
    Supports Shatalin Program *[TASS]* 29
    Speech Carried on Moscow Radio 29
Academicians Debate Economic Reform Proposals 33
    Aganbegyan Backs Shatalin Plan *[Moscow TV]* 33
    Shatalin on Property, Currency *[Moscow TV]* 35
    Abalkin on Switch to Market *[Moscow TV]* 36
    Farmers' Union Opposes Plan *[TASS]* 38
Lukyanov Speaks on Armenian Hunger Strikers *[Moscow TV]* 39
Merits of Rival Economic Programs Weighed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 Sep]* 39
Decision on Economic Program Expected 26 Sep *[Moscow TV]* 41
Session Resumes 18 Sep; Gorbachev Takes Part *[TASS]* 41
Deputies Receive Responses to 17 Sep Proceedings *[Moscow TV]* 41
First Week of Supreme Soviet Session Appraised *[PRAVDA 16 Sep]* 42

Political & Social

Reports Continue on 16 Sep Anti-Goverment Rally 43
    Shatalin on Constitution *[Moscow Radio]* 43
    'Radical Transition' Sought *[Moscow International]* 44
Ryzhkov Greets Tashkent Islamic Conference *[TASS]* 44
Weekly's Poll on Views of CPSU Criticized *[PRAVDA 13 Sep]* 44
Specialists Forecast CPSU Budget Deficit *[Moscow TV]* 46
Ligachev Promises 'Whole Truth' in Book *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 46
Nishanov, Abdulatipov Remark on Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 47
Constitution Panel Discusses Residence Permits *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 47
Biryukova Retires From Deputy Premiership *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Jewish Oblast Head Leaves Party Post *[TASS]* 48

Economic

Petrakov on Gorbachev's Role in Shatalin Group *[TASS]* 48
Gidaspov Cited on Transition to Market Economy *[TASS]* 49
Popov, Sobchak Speak at Free Market Conference *[Moscow TV]* 49
Goskomstat Reports 'Man-Days' Lost to Strikes *[Moscow Radio]* 50
State Commercial Bank Established in Siberia *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Chelyabinsk Refinery Stops Gasoline Deliveries *[Moscow Radio]* 50

Agricultural

Novosibirsk Grain Farmers Need Trucks, Drivers *[Moscow TV]* 50
Smolensk Mill Fails To Receive Grain Deliveries *[Moscow TV]* 51
Grain Harvest Yields Decline This Year *[SELSKAYA ZHIHN 14 Sep]* 51
Cotton Farm Goes Cooperative, Doubles Yield *[Moscow TV]* 52
Autonomy Brings Kazakhstan Farm Success *[Moscow TV]* 53

Scientific

Cleanup Under Way After Beryllium Plant Accident *[IZVESTIYA 18 Sep]* 53
Cargo Craft Separates From Mir Complex *[TASS]* 54

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Supreme Council Convenes 18 Sep *[Vilnius Radio]* 55
Pro-Union Lithuanian Party Approves Program *[TASS]* 55
Lithuanian Leaders Respond to Politburo Appeal *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Kaitseliit 'Provocative' Acts Called 'Training' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Sep]* 56
    'Provacations' Within Law *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Sep]* 56
USSR, Estonian Supreme Soviets Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 57
Latvian Independent Communists To Change Name *[TASS]* 57
    Renamed Democratic Labor Party *[TASS]* 57

RSFSR

14 Sep RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session Carried *[Moscow TV]* 58
'Collapse' of Army Discussed at Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Trade Union Leader Seeks Government's Resignation *[TASS]* 60
Silayev, Russian Unions Discuss '500 Days' Plan *[TRUD 13 Sep]* 60
Silayev News Conference on '500 Days' Program 61
    Program To Begin on 1 Oct *[Moscow TV]* 61
    Stresses 'Unity' in Reform Program *[Moscow Radio]* 62
    Denies Claims of 'Shock Therapy' *[TASS]* 62
Leningrad, Estonia Sign Cooperation Agreement *[TASS]* 63
Leningrad Rally Calls for Restoration of Name *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Sep]* 63

Dzerzhinsk Mayor's Post Abolished *[IZVESTIYA 14 Sep]* 64
Vladimir Oblast Journalists Call Off Strike *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Sep]* 64
Fuel Shortages Disrupt Far North Airline Flights *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Sep]* 64

Western Republics

Belorussia, Lithuania Sign Economic Protocol *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Moldavia Issues Decrees Against Gagauz Movement 65
  Calls Congress 'Unconstitutional' *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 22 Aug]* 65
  Calls for Movement's Disbandment *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 23 Aug]* 67
  Decries Leaders' 'Dilettantism' *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 31 Aug]* 67
'Thousands' of Ukrainians Protest Treaty Signing *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Ukrainian Liberal Democratic Party Organized *[Kiev Radio]* 68
Ukraine Housing Shortage Boosts Social Tension *[TASS]* 68

Caucasus

Armenian Leader Meets Azerbaijan's Mutalibov *[TASS]* 69
Ter-Petrosyan: People Back Disarming of Gunmen *[TASS]* 69
Armenian Interior Minister Assails PRAVDA *[ARMENPRES]* 69
Yerevan Curfew Reduced; Crimes Down 'Markedly' *[TASS]* 70
Interior Ministry Reports Situation 'Quiet' *[TASS]* 70
Coverage Continues on Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 70
  Troop Interference Decried *[ARMENPRES]* 70
  Protest in Martuninskiy Rayon *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
  Armenian Soviet Issues Appeal *[Moscow Radio]* 72
Crowd Ransacks KGB Headquarters in Tbilisi *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Sep]* 72
Significance of Georgian Elections Pondered *[TASS]* 72

Central Asia

Tajikistan Tension 'Shows No Signs of Abating' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 73
Ashkhabad Transport Militia Staffers on Strike *[IZVESTIYA 12 Sep]* 74
Kazakhstan Recognizes 6 Oct as Republic Day *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 75

Vladimir Bogachev on Nuclear Weapons in Europe

LD1709214190 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Andersson told the congress of the Social Democratic Workers' Party in Stockholm that practical preconditions were now ripe for creating a new European peace order and called for the withdrawal of shorter range nuclear weapons from European territory.

The nuclear arms issue, as regards weapons with a range below 500 kilometers, has for a long time served as litmus paper to define with great precision the actual attitude of one or another country to disarmament.

After the Soviet Union and the United States signed the intermediate nuclear force treaty, the Soviet Union proposed holding talks on nuclear weapons with a range below 500 kilometers.

The United States categorically turned down that initiative. In April 1989, Pentagon chief Richard Cheney described the proposal to hold negotiations on shorter range nuclear weapons as a dangerous trap and declared himself against holding any such talks in [the] foreseeable future.

Moreover, Washington announced plans to modernise land-based shorter range missiles in order to compensate for reductions under the INF Treaty.

However, nothing lasts under the moon, as the saying goes. Under the pressure of developments in Europe, the U.S. stance towards shorter range nuclear weapons has undergone changes.

President Bush eventually said the United States was ready to begin negotiations on the fate of these weapons, but only after signing an agreement of conventional arms in Europe.

Washington officials hurried to specify that such negotiations should not aim at the complete elimination of shorter range weapons, as the Soviet Union had proposed.

Americans gave up some provisions of their flexible response concept, which envisaged the use of shorter range nuclear weapons in the early phases of any armed conflict in Europe. The United States has also renounced plans to modernise its shorter-range lance missiles and its nuclear artillery.

Nevertheless, the road towards negotiations on shorter-range nuclear weapons has not become much easier. Last June, NATO turned down the Soviet proposal to begin talks on shorter-range nuclear arms in Autumn of 1990, regardless of the time when the conventional arms accord may be signed.

While the Soviet Union withdrew 500 nuclear charges from Eastern Europe, the United States is working on a plan to deploy in Western Europe another 400 nuclear missiles, borne by F-15, F-16 and F-111 aircraft. Taking into account the range of these aircraft, air-to-ground missiles will be able to reach installations deep within Soviet territory.

The Soviet Union decided in 1990 to further reduce its shorter range nuclear forces in Europe unilaterally. It set no pre-conditions and aimed at creating favourable conditions for talks.

Moscow believes that a real opportunity is now offering itself for a radical reduction of shorter range nuclear forces in Europe. The realization of Swedish Minister Sten Andersson's proposal to withdraw shorter range nuclear weapons from Europe would be a major step towards stronger peace and stability on the continent.

Ladygin Interviewed on Geneva Talks, 'Open Skies'

LD1409134090 Moscow IAN in English 29 Aug 90

[Interview with Major General Fedor Ladygin, department head, General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, by Yuriy Lebedev: "What Is New at the Talks?"—press release]

[Text] Question: The Washington Post has reported that the Soviet-US talks on strategic offensive forces, (SOF) in Geneva have recently been skidding due to the great number of differences. This raised doubts as to whether the treaty might be finished by the end of this year. Will you comment, please?

Answer: During the Soviet-US summit in Washington in June this year the sides reaffirmed their resolve to wrap up work on the treaty by the end of this year. The leaders of our two states charged their delegations in Geneva to speed up the work on the joint draft. Yet many problems, some of them very complicated, remain unresolved.

The Soviet side is not dramatising the "great number of differences" and, guided by the Soviet President's order, is doing everything in its power to help the Geneva talks gather momentum in the interests of the search for solutions.

Of course, such solutions should be mutually acceptable and lead to the practical reduction of the strategic nuclear capabilities of the sides, lessen the risk of a nuclear war and block the channels of the arms race.

We cannot agree to the "obsolete" Minuteman-2 and Poseidon missiles being used for orbiting space-based armaments or as targets during thetest of SDI systems, something which the US is advocating, according to The Washington Post.

This would mean giving the green light to the use of the reduced armaments for accelerating the creation of space-based strike systems, which would open a new channel of the arms race. The use of "obsolete" Minuteman-2 and Poseidon missiles, as well as other ICBMs and SLBMs that are to be reduced, would speed up the work on the SDI programme, which in its turn would disrupt the organic connection between defensive and offensive strategic armaments.

The creation of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements in the US would undermine strategic stability and launch a new spiral of the arms race.

Yet we believe that solutions to the outstanding problems, even the most difficult, can and must be found before the deadline fixed in Washington. But our readiness to complete the drafting of the treaty by the end of this year presupposes a similar readiness of our partner.

It is clear that the Geneva talks will be greatly boosted by the September meeting of Shevardnadze and Baker, in particular it will help solve the problems mentioned by The Washington Post.

Question: The Soviet Union and China have held lengthy consultations on military problems, which has paved the way to official talks. Could you say a few words about the essence of these consultations and the aims of the future talks?

Answer: One of the results of Gorbachev's visit to China in May 1989, which opened a new stage in Sino-Soviet relations, was the sides' agreement to take measures to reduce their armed forces deployed on the border to a minimum correspondingo normal neighbourly relations.

The Sino-Soviet group of diplomats and military experts, established to carry out this agreement, started working in November 1989. It has done much to draft the agreement on the guidlines for mutual reductions on the Sino-Soviet border and for building up trust in the military sphere.

The agreement was signed by the sides' foreign ministers during Premier Li Peng's visit to the Soviet Union in April 1990. The sides have agreed to start talks on the realisation of this agreement in the autumn of 1990.

The talks are expected to discuss the types of armed forces and armaments to be reduced, to determine the geographical zones, parameters and the schedule of reductions. Under the agreement, the reductions should start with the offensive components, so that the units remaining on the border are restructured to fulfill only defensive tasks.

It is also planned to establish a bilateral mechanism for effective verification of compliance with the future agreements on mutual reductions and to draft effective measures for building up military trust on the Sino-Soviet border.

The beginning Sino-Soviet talks on military problems and agreements expected to be signed will be a major contribution to the development of Sino-Soviet relations on the principles of trust, neighbourliness and cooperation.

Questions: There were two rounds of the "open skies" conference held, with the last one ending in Budapest on May 10 this year. What did the participants in the conference achieve at these rounds? Will there be more rounds and when?

Answer: The initiative regarding the "open skies" concept was taken by the United States of America. The Soviet Union supported the concept as an important confidence-building measure. Naturally, this concerns those countries which will agree on a treaty basis to open their air space for unarmed aircraft flights to monitor military activities.

The United States, the USSR, Canada and a number of other countries have started joint work on the technicalities of this concept. This work is being done in the form of an international conference. The second round of the conference was held in Budapest in April-May of 1990. The participants produced a draft agreement, rather a voluminous document incorporating both agreed-upon and so far outstanding provisions.

The conference showed substantial differences of approach to principled questions. The US and other NATO countries are opposed to developing a single bank of data obtained as a result of flights. The Soviet side believes that it is precisely the development of a single data bank and free access to its by any party to the agreement would help strengthen the "open skies" regime.

Western countries do not agree with the idea that all the participating states should use agreed-upon data-collecting equipment having the same characteristics sufficient for attaining the purposes of the "open skies" regime. The on-board instrumentation proposed by them and its specifications make it possible to obtain more vast information than envisaged by this regime.

The United States and a number of other countries insist that the monitoring party use only its own aircraft to fly over the territory of the party under surveillance. In this matter, the Soviet Union adheres to a more flexible approach, where the party under observation would decide whose aircraft—of the monitoring country under surveillance or a third country—with appropriate agreed- upon equipment on board is to be used to survey its territory. It would be possible to establish a single fleet of aircraft for all countries.

The "open skies" conference has been adjourned to enable mutual analysis of the positions. A search is under way for their possible approximation. The schedule for finalising agreement depends on when all key problems are resolved without detriment to any of the sides. The conference will resume work as soon as appropriate conditions are prepared for this.

Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Held in Geneva

LD1109215290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 11 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] An international review conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which came into effect in 1970, is underway in Geneva.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Dmitriyev] Representatives of the countries signatories to the treaty assemble every five years to check the efficiency of the international regime of nonproliferation based on the treaty. [passage omitted]

The treaty has been in effect for 20 years. Nobody has withdrawn from it; nevertheless, this most important document has not yet acquired a universal character. What do you think of this?

[V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs] Yes, you are right, and this is something that today worries the states that have come to the current conference. Although, with 141 participants, the treaty is the most representative one, a whole number of states, including near-nuclear ones, are outside the treaty. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Petrovskiy on Treaty Review

PM1709102590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

[Interview with V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, by unnamed PRAVDA Correspondent under the "Our Interviews" rubric: "How Is the Treaty Working?"—first paragraph is editorial introduction—passages between slantlines are printed in boldface]

[Text] The fourth conference examining the operation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons ended in Geneva on Friday. Your PRAVDA Correspondent asked V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister and head of the Soviet delegation, to give his impressions of this representative international forum's work.

"The fourth conference examining the operation of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty began work in a new international political atmosphere fundamentally different from that in which previous conferences took place," V.F. Petrovskiy said. "The current stage of world development contains a real prospect of a transition to mankind's guaranteed survival and the exclusion of the threat of mutual destruction.

"However, it can hardly be expected that the new, safe, and democratic world, where each nation will be guaranteed freedom of choice and independence and where there will be no place for aggressors or annexation, will descend upon us like manna from heaven. Its creation will require not only painstaking work but also the determination to defend the principles of civilized relations between states."

[Correspondent] Vladimir Fedorovich, what role does the Soviet Union assign to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the efforts to achieve a new state of peace?

[Petrovskiy] We regard this treaty, a most important and prestigious treaty which formed the basis of the international regime restricting the spread of nuclear weapons, as a major factor for security and stability in a rapidly changing world.

Today the Non-Proliferation Treaty is one of the support structures of the secure world order that is being built by joint efforts. The architectural scheme designed by mankind's collective reason, is demonstrating its practicability and durability. Nonproliferation is steadily acquiring the substance of a universal legal and moral norm.

The treaty meets the interests of both nuclear and nonnuclear states. It gives legal form to the ancient oriental proverb that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. There is no alternative to the treaty at present. And in the future it can only be replaced by an all-embracing agreement not to create nuclear weapons again after their complete and final elimination from mankind's life.

[Correspondent] As is well known, this is precisely the aim of the program for the phased elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction put forward by our country on 15 January 1986. How is its implementation proceeding?

[Petrovskiy] The first and, thus, particularly important step toward implementing the nuclear disarmament program was the entry into force of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. Its main political significance is that it broke the vicious circle of the nuclear arms race.

In the common assessment of the USSR and the United States at the highest level, the fulfillment of the treaty is proceeding normally. The sides have completed the destruction of their shorter-range missiles. By 1 June 1990 the Soviet Union had eliminated in all over 1,500 intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles (around 90 percent of the initial quantity).

The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive weapons will mark the beginning of the largest reduction of the strategic arsenals running to hundreds of delivery vehicles and thousands of warheads.

Furthermore, immediately after the conclusion of the treaty now in preparation, the USSR and the United States will hold consultations on future talks on nuclear and space arms and the further strengthening of strategic stability and will begin those talks at the earliest practicable time.

A real opportunity is also opening up for radical reductions in tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. For its part, the Soviet Union has already begun moving in that direction. Since 1989 five hundred nuclear warheads have been removed from our allies' territory. In 1989-1990 the USSR did not modernize or replace its tactical nuclear missiles.

To create favorable conditions for the talks, we adopted a decision to embark this year on a further reduction of these weapons in Europe. The USSR is implementing these measures unilaterally without setting any prior conditions. We also note the countermoves by the NATO countries and their agreement to hold talks on nuclear arms in Europe.

It is important not only to reduce and eliminate the existing stockpiles of nuclear arms but also to seek opportunities to prevent the nuclear arsenals from being restocked. We advocate banning the production of fissionable materials for weapons-making purposes. In our view, such a ban could provide a firm protection simultaneously against both "vertical" and "horizontal" proliferation.

We have unilaterally ceased production of highly enriched uranium and embarked on a program for the gradual decomissioning before the year 2000 of all our industrial reactors producing weapons-grade plutonium. In addition, the Soviet Union has put forward a proposal at the United Nations to negotiate on the nonuse for military purposes of nuclear materials made available by the reduction of the nuclear arsenals and on the elaboration of the corresponding verification mechanism. It is our profound conviction that the attainment of such accords would mark the beginning of the formation an all-embracing system of guarantees that nuclear weapons would not be created again.

One of the Soviet Union's priorities in the nuclear disarmament sphere is the earliest possible attainment of an all-embracing nuclear weapon test ban. In the 18 months from August 1985 to February 1987, the USSR maintained a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Subsequently, too, we repeatedly declared our readiness to return at any time to the moratorium on nuclear explosions on a basis of reciprocity with the United States. Evidence of the seriousness of our intentions in this sphere and of our faithfulness to our commitments under the Non-Proliferation Treaty was provided by the Soviet Union's substantial reduction of its test program recently. Furthermore, since October 1989 our nuclear test ranges have been silent.

In parallel with the elaboration of accords aimed at reducing and eliminating the nuclear arsenals, it is necessary to work to strengthen the guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons.

From the conference's lofty platform, the Soviet Union confirmed the previous guarantees of the security of nonnuclear states. The USSR's military doctrine is entirely defensive: Our country will never be first to use nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union actively supports efforts aimed at the creation in various parts of the world of zones free of nuclear weapons. The creation of such zones is a weighty contribution to consolidating regional and global security, restricting the geographical sphere of nuclear preparations, and thus strengthening the nuclear weapons nonproliferation regime.

[Correspondent] The most important element of the maintenance and strengthening of the nuclear weapons nonproliferation regime is the verification activity of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA]. What is the USSR's contribution to increasing the effectiveness and authority of the IAEA?

[Petrovskiy] In keeping with its commitments under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Soviet Union supplies nuclear materials and equipment to states not possessing nuclear weapons only on condition that the IAEA guarantees are applied.

We are actively cooperating with the agency in carrying out inspections at our civilian nuclear installations. As a goodwill gesture, the Soviet Union is ready to considerably extend the list of Soviet nuclear facilities open to verification by the agency including all Soviet nuclear electric power stations as well as a further number of research reactors.

The most important area of international cooperation coordinated by the IAEA is ensuring the safe development of the nuclear power industry. For our country, which experienced the Chernobyl tragedy, everything connected with the safety of the nuclear power industry is of crucial, vital significance. Therefore we are fully resolved to participate actively in international attempts to find the safest means of harnessing the creative potential of nuclear energy.

Former KGB Official on Czech's U.S. Contacts

LD1709192190 Prague CTK in English 1823 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow Sept 15 (CTK correspondent)—Retired Soviet KGB Colonel V. Kosolapov has alleged that Czechoslovak Deputy Interior Minister Jan Ruml had contacts with U.S. intelligence services at the U.S. Embassy in Prague before the November 1989 revolution and still maintains them today.

Colonel Kosolapov was a deputy to the representative of the Soviet secret service KGB at the Federal Interior Ministry in Prague between December 1986 and February 1990.

In an interview in response to Jan Ruml's interview in the Soviet weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, Kosolapov rejected "Ruml's allegations about the nonexistence of contacts with the KGB". He referred to the Soviet paper PRAVDA which reported on February 28, 1990 the signing of an agreement between the KGB and the Czechoslovak Interior Ministry during President Havel's visit to Moscow.

Kosolapov denied the possibility of some documents of the Czechoslovak Interior Ministry being hidden in the USSR, and criticized Ruml for his statement that the new Czechoslovak intelligence service "would not work in line with KGB principles". Kosolapov believes that Ruml sought in this way to cast a shadow on the Soviet security bodies.

Kosolapov clearly alluded to Ruml's alleged contact with U.S. intelligence services when he said that "the variant developed in Czechoslovakia at present with the state security bodies in connection with the KGB has, in my opinion, hardly originated only in Prague".

Shevardnadze, Genscher Speak on Treaty With Germany

PM1409115590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Crucial Document"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher initialed the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation between the USSR and Germany in Moscow 13 September.

In his speech on this occasion, the Soviet minister emphasized that the treaty, the idea of which belongs to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Federal Chancellor H. Kohl, marks the beginning of a new stage in Soviet-German relations. It is a crucial document in terms of its spirit and content. It is a charter for our life during the transition into the next century.

The treaty, which has been initialed, E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out, reflects the will and resolve of both countries to turn to the powerful life-giving sources of the traditions of peaceful and fruitful cooperation between the Russian State and the Soviet Union and Germany.

The treaty defines anew relations in questions of security, and it rules out the first use of armed forces against one another and any provision of military assistance to an attacker if the USSR or Germany were to be the target of any aggression. It enshrines the principles of strict respect for rights and interests, establishment of defense sufficiency levels, and solution of any emerging disputed questions via consultations. Its aim is to develop the Helsinki process and to build single legal, economic, cultural, and information spaces in Europe. It is geared to a new quality of cooperation in the spheres of the economy, industry, ecology, science, and technology. Broad prospects are also offered for reciprocal enrichment of our peoples' cultures, and for contacts between parliaments, parties, trade unions, young people, and social and humanitarian institutions and organizations.

In his speech the FRG minister, like his Soviet colleague, noted that the treaty provides a reliable foundation for the further expansion of German-Soviet relations and leads our two countries into the 21st century which will be distinguished by responsibility, trust, and cooperation.

At the time of Germany's unification, which is so important for us Germans, we are interested, he said, in agreeing with the Soviet Union and its peoples on reliable and responsible partnership in building a future, to which we will dedicate all our potential.

Germany today and tomorrow, H.-D. Genscher went on, is a Germany of peace. Allow me to state yet again, right here in Moscow: We appreciate the fact that the Soviet Union is also banking on a free and democratic Germany.

This all-embracing treaty, the speaker went on to say, became possible because our actions are no longer governed by enmity and potential threat, by rivalry and confrontation between blocs. They are governed by a will for broad collaboration and creation of all-European structures.

Now we are fully entitled to state, the German minister emphasized, that the postwar period is over. The treaty between our two countries marks the beginning of the new European development. It is a contribution to durable peaceful partnership, to cooperation and trust on our continent which are geared to the future, H.-D. Genscher concluded.

It was agreed that the treaty, which was concluded for 20 years with a provision for its extension, will be signed after 3 October, the officially announced date for Germany's unification.

Shevardnadze, Dumas Meeting Reported

PM1409133190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting with French Foreign Minister"]

[Text] On 12 September E.A. Shevardnadze met with R. Dumas, French minister of state and foreign minister. The ministers expressed satisfaction in connection with the completion of work on the settlement of the foreign policy aspects of Germany's unification. They touched on questions of bilateral relations in the perespective of a Soviet-French summit meeting.

Portugalov on International Role of Germany

AU1709095190 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG in German 16 Sep 90 p 2

[Interview with Nikolay Portugalov, Gorbachev's expert on Germany, by F. Wecbach-Mara; place and date not given: "Moscow: Germans to the Table of the World Powers"]

[Text] [Weckbach-Mara] In what way does unification change Germany's international prestige?

[Portugalov] The reestablishment of German unity means Germany's return to world affairs and as a modern big power, whose importance is determined not by its lead in armament but by the enormous economic potential of one of the world's big nations and the almost perfect social welfare system. There is no doubt that the new Germany will have not only regional European but also global political dimensions—with a bridging function between East and West.

[Weckbach-Mara] As of when?

[Portugalov] Even though the growing together of the western and eastern parts of the country will take a certain time and will cost a lot of effort and money, Germany has to grow into its new role in the world already today. The latest talks in Bonn about the Bundeswehr's mission in the Persian Gulf under the orders of the United Nations—and thus outside the NATO area—prove this.

[Weckbach-Mara] Should Germany then also become a permanent member of the UN Security Council—in addition to the United States, the USSR, Great Britain, France, and China?

[Portugalov] Yes, it is obvious that the united Germany should also assume responsibility in the world within the framework of the UN as the sixth permanent member of the Security Council and that this decision by the world forum will not take too long. I am also certain that it will then be adopted practically unanimously.

[Weckbach-Mara] Why?

[Portugalov] For two reasons, above all: Since the end of the cold war and during the postwar period the UN has been on the difficult path of developing into a true world body. In the potential crisis management in one or the other of the world's regions it will neither be able to do without the help and possibilities of a united Germany nor will it want to do so. On the other hand, a new Germany with full sovereignty will also have to defend itself against fears and envy from the outside. The status of a permanent member of the UN Security Council—as an expression of the full responsibility shared with the other big powers—would be very helpful in this respect.

[Weckbach-Mara] Is the German role in Europe not sufficient for this?

[Portugalov] No. European integration is a corset that is a bit too tight for the united Germany—not to mention the ailing NATO.

Aleksandr Bovin on Impact of 'New Germany'

PM1409174990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Diary": "The New Germany"]

[Text] On Wednesday 12 September in Moscow the foreign ministers of the FRG, the GDR, the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France signed the Treaty on a final settlement with regard to Germany. The following day the USSR and FRG foreign ministers initialed the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation between the USSR and the future united Germany. This is yet further evidence that the cold war is a thing of the past and that a new world order is taking shape.

The formation of the united Germany is happening faster than any calculations or predictions said it would. On 3 October the decision on the affiliation of the GDR to the FRG will go into force in accordance with Article 23 of the Fundamental Law of the Federal Republic. In other words, the GDR will disappear and be absorbed into the single German state.

Let me remind you of a few dates.

On 7 October 1989 the 40th anniversary of the German socialist state was celebrated.

On 9 November 1989 the Berlin Wall ceased to divide the western and eastern parts of the city and the border was opened.

On 18 May 1990 the first state treaty between the GDR and the FRG (on currency, economic, and social union) was signed; on 1 July it went into force and the use of the West German mark was extended to GDR territory.

On 31 August 1990 the second state treaty between the GDR and the FRG (on the mechanism whereby the GDR will join the FRG) was signed; NEUES DEUTSCHLAND called that document "evidence of the demise of the GDR."

The aforementioned documents regulate the internal aspects and resolve the internal problems of German unification. It should be noted, meanwhile, that it took less than one year for a state which called itself socialist to be dismantled; the rapid reformation of a socialist economy as an economy of the socialist market type had begun.

At the same time, the unification of Germany also has external, international legal aspects, which were reflected in the Moscow treaty (for example, borders, Germany's military political commitments, and the termination of the special rights of the four victorious powers).

I shall mention the main one. The present borders are deemed inviolable. Germany renounces all territorial claims. Its Armed Forces are to be reduced to 370,000 men. Germany will not produce, possess, or transfer weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical, and biological). The rights and responsibilities of the four powers are to cease. Germany will acquire full sovereignty.

The path to the definitive formulas was not always straightforward. There were clashes of positions and a different understanding of the problems and situation. The FRG insisted, for example, that the rights and duties of the four powers end 3 October and that accordingly this date be considered the day of the de jure restoration of sovereignty. The USSR suggested a different solution: That legal sovereignty be restored after the treaty is ratified by the parliaments of the four powers as well as by the Bundestag of the united Germany to be elected on 2 December. The latter was adopted.

The Soviet Union believed that it would be useful to have a special mechanism to monitor Germany's observance of its commitments. This idea was turned down on the grounds that such a mechanism will be provided by the Vienna and other agreements.

While the treaty was being drawn up two Soviet-German documents were also being prepared: on the legal status of Soviet servicemen and on currency and financial questions (the so-called "transitional treaty"). It was agreed that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from what is presently GDR territory will be completed by 31 December 1994. The FRG has pledged to take part in financing the presence, withdrawal, and subsequent placement of the Soviet troops. Twelve billion marks [DM] plus DM3 billion interest-free credit are to be allocated for these purposes, including the construction of housing on USSR territory.

It is not hard to see that the united Germany will change the landscape of the European Continent. The FRG alone—without the GDR—is third in the world (after the United States and Japan) in terms of GNP. One-fourth of world trade is with the FRG. Industrial might combined with vast financial potential. In 1989 the FRG was the world's second largest creditor (after Japan); its net assets amount to DM427 billion.

This economic giant will not be a political dwarf. The end of the cold war, the four victorious states' renunciation of their paramount rights in Germany and the reduction of the significance of military strength factors in international affairs will ensure the future Germany a dominant position in Europe—despite the preservation of nonnuclear status.

Should this be feared? I am sure that it should not; because the world today is fundamentally different from the world of 1941.

We can see, of course, that revanchist feelings exist in Germany and there are people there who are psychologically inclined toward fanaticism and a new version of megalomania. But they are not the ones who call the shots. A stable democratic society has formed in the FRG and a return to the past is effectively precluded.

There are firm traditions and experience of economic and political cooperation between the USSR and the GDR and the USSR and the FRG which work in favor of a presumption of trust. It can be assumed that the united Germany will be extremely interested in a permanent partner with an extraordinarily voluminous market and consistent needs for foreign investments.

Both we and the Germans are looking ahead. The Soviet-German treaty on long-term (20-year) large-scale economic, trade, and scientific and technical cooperation is virtually agreed. And in Moscow, as I have said, the treaty containing the basic principles of mutual relations between the USSR and Germany has already been initialed.

Of course, the future is far from idyllic. There will be difficulties and clashes of interest; but the building of the common European home is going on, as is the strengthening of the new world order. I hope that in the new historic conditions, relations between the new Germany and the new (I also hope!) Soviet Union will be one of the stabilizing factors of international life.

TASS Observer Reflects on Treaty With Germany

LD1409222790 Moscow TASS International Service in German 1334 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS Political Observer Aleksandr Antisferov]

[Text] Moscow, 14 Sep (TASS)—If it were possible to represent international agreements as genres of creative literature, the epigraph to the text of the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation between the USSR and Germany could well be the words spoken by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG minister of foreign affairs, at the ceremony to mark the occasion: "We now have a complete right to say that the postwar period is over. The treaty between our two countries marks the start of a new European development."

This utterance fully reflects both the scale and spirit of the bilateral accords which have been attained, as well as their influence on the entire all-European process ahead. And could it be otherwise indeed, when it is a matter of a treaty between the major powers of the continent—the

Soviet Union and the future united Germany? Incidentally, the word "future" as applied to Germany will recede day by day into the past if it is borne in mind that on the eve of initialing the Soviet-German treaty, the signing of another document took place in Moscow, that of the treaty on a final settlement regarding Germany, which "gave the go-ahead" for the reunification of the FRG and GDR into a single sovereign state.

The 22 articles of the Treaty of Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation will for many years determine the development of mutual relations between the two countries in practically all areas, including politics, economics, science, technology, culture, and environmental protection. There is no doubt that in Europe and throughout the world as a whole, approval will meet the obligations of the sides recorded in the treaty on their mutual respect for existing frontiers, their refusal toward territorial claims, and the use of force against one another. Accords on regular Soviet-German contacts and consultations, including those at summit level, and the simplification of procedures for obtaining entry visas, also correspond to the interests of both states and to improving the political climate in Europe in the spirit of the new realities that are coming into being on the continent.

The expansion of economic cooperation between the two countries provided for under the treaty is similarly of no little importance. And should anyone get it into their heads to see this aspect from the viewpoint of the particular interest the USSR has in supporting its own economy, which is undergoing difficulties today, it is worth recalling that Germany too has just as great a need for a reliable trading partner to set its economy back on an even keel after uniting the GDR to the FRG.

The West German media has every grounds for noting that in its entire history, the Soviet Union has never concluded a treaty of such magnitude with a capitalist country. No doubt here too is the dictate of the times and the logic of new political thinking. In this connection it is probably worth drawing attention to the fact that this treaty will at the same time be one of the first international acts of the renewed single Germany. Nor can the fact that this country is taking its first steps in a positive direction fail to be both pleasing and encouraging.

And finally: As West Germany's ZDF television program reported with reference to information from the FRG Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the treaty initialed in Moscow is to be signed after the unification of Germany by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl. This corresponds both to justice and logic; after all, it is to these two that the ideas of the treaty and its inspiration belong.

'International Panorama' on Two-Plus-Four Talks

LD1609105390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1310 GMT on 15 September, in its "International Panorama" program, carries a six-minute video report by correspondent Zholkver on the two-plus-four talks in Moscow. As the video shows pictures of officials crowding around Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, Hurd and other leaders involved in the talks, Zholkver lists the results of the talks and explains the meaning of the treaty.

This introduction is then followed by a video of Shevardnadze speaking at what appears to be a news conference after signing the treaty. Shevardnadze says: "There is quite widespread apprehension that the interests of our country and other states may suffer and that security may be harmed as a result of the German settlement. We have taken into account these apprehensions when elaborating the treaty on the final settlement with respect to Germany and also the whole aspect of the bilateral accords with the unified Germany. We think that we have managed to obtain all the necessary guarantees and pledges which correspond to real conditions and the situation in Europe."

This brief video of Shevardnadze is followed by Zholkver conducting an interview with Genscher, who speaks as follows (in German, with superimposed Russian translation): "In the past the USSR had good relations both with the FRG and the GDR. However they were complicated by the divided Germany. Relations which will develop now that Germany is unified will be more than just a sum total of the relations that the two German states used to have with your country. New prospects are opening up for our two peoples and for all of Europe. To confirm the earnestness of our intentions, we will sign in the very near future a comprehensive treaty on the nature of our future mutual relations.

"So, in my view, the date of 12 September not only concludes a certain stage of history but also opens up a new stage. And our people, who have not yet forgotten the sufferings of the past war, are especially concerned with the question of the military and political status of the future unified Germany, and its place in the European security system. And on this day, we wish to recall the millions of victims of the war waged by Hitler. They call on us to learn lessons from history and to build a new better Europe. We are sure that the unification of Germany will not create in Europe any additional problems. On the contrary, it will open up a way to strengthen Europe's security. In the last few months the pan-European process has been developing successfully, and pan-European security structures are being created. We are confident that the strengthening of trust will be promoted by Germany's renunciation of weapons of mass destruction and by nearly halving the strength of its armed forces. We hope that this will be followed by other measures to strengthen mutual trust."

After this interview Zholkver is shown interviewing De Maiziere, who speaks on the history of good and close relations between East Germany and the USSR; all treaties that were signed before will remain valid, he says.

Yazov, Shlyaga Greet International Film Festival

PM1709142590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Message from Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov and Colonel General N. Shlyaga: "To the Participants and Guests of the 16th International Movie and Photo Festival of Friendly Armies"]

[Text] Dear Friends!

We cordially greet you - the participants and guests in the 16th international festival of documentary makers and expert photojournalists from the friendly armies. It is profoundly symbolic that its slogan is the phrase "For the Sake of Peace and Security." Nothing is more in keeping with the spirit of the times. There is no nobler task today for "men under arms" or for anyone who cherishes the fate of the fatherland.

The imperative of our time is peace through reason. New political thinking is moving out of the sphere of appeals and becoming a reality. Mankind is actively creating a new structure of cooperation: from confrontation via competition to partnership—that is the formula for life. A prominent place in it is played by popular diplomacy—the shortest and most accessible route from person to person and from people to people. Your festival provides excellent opportunities to shorten that route, to satisfy the vibrant mutual interest in the history, culture, and modern life of our countries and armies, and to help us to see more clearly and come to know and understand each other better.

The movies and photojournalism at this and at previous forums convincingly confirms yet again, we believe, that the friendly armies' documentary makers and photojournalists are not just people who dispassionately record life but are genuine present-day historians. And they record it in vivid, accurate forms that reveal the full complexity and completeness of people's spiritual world—the world of workers and soldiers, who value security, work, peace, and happiness equally.

We are confident that the festival will be a notable event that will strengthen still further the bonds of combat cooperation, demonstrate the new creative achievements of military documentary makers and photographers, and reveal new names and original works that provide a profound study of the processes of the renewal of life in our countries and their armed forces.

We sincerely wish the festival success, and we trust that all the participants will produce creative achievements in their noble work for the sake of peace and security on the planet.

[Signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR defense minister
Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate

Comparison of Gorbachev Meeting With Genscher

PM1309104190

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 13 September 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page one a TASS report on President Gorbachev's 12 September meeting with the FRG foreign minister. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Meeting With H.D. Genscher," has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version revealing the following variation:

Page 3, column two, paragraph three, sentence two reads: ...in Soviet-German relations are being turned and new pages are...(adding the word "being")

United States & Canada

Former President Reagan Arrives for Visit 16 Sep

Sobchak Greets Reagans

PM1709104790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting in Leningrad"]

[Text] Leningrad 15 Sep—Former U.S. President R. Reagan and his wife arrived in the Soviet Union today in response to the invitation which USSR President M.S. Gorbachev made during their meeting in San Francisco in June this year.

The guests were welcomed at Leningrad's Pulkovo Airport by Leningrad City Soviet Chairman A.A. Sobchak and other officials.

The welcoming party included U.S. Consul General in Leningrad R. Miles.

Met by Medvedev in Moscow

PM1709124590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "R. Reagan's Arrival in Moscow"]

[Text] Following a brief acquaintance with Leningrad former U.S. President R. Reagan and his wife arrived in Moscow 16 September. He is making this trip to our country at the invitation of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev—an invitation issued during their meeting in San Francisco in June.

The guest was met at the airport by V.A. Medvedev, USSR Presidential Council member, and other officials.

The reception party included J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

R. Reagan and his wife attended a religious service in the Trinity Cathedral at the Aleksandr Nevskiy Monastery. They laid flowers at the graves of F.M. Dostoyevskiy and P.I. Tchaikovsky in the monastery cemetery.

The guests were shown the city sights and visited Pavlovsk.

Reagan Meets With Gorbachev 17 Sep

LD1709171890 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—President Gorbachev today received former U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

During a substantial and sincere talk held in a friendly atmosphere, Gorbachev informed Reagan of economic and political restructuring in the Soviet Union. Reagan spoke of peculiarities of economic life in the United States.

They discussed the state of and prospects for the development of mutually advantageous cooperation and partnership between the Soviet Union and the United States. They agreed that the Helsinki summit has advanced Soviet-U.S. relations to a new level.

Gorbachev noted Reagan's constructive role in the positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations, saying Reagan was at the stem of the trend that led to their normalisation and improvement.

Cold war has ended, and there are grounds to believe that significant results can be reached on 50 percent cuts of strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States in the foreseeable future, Gorbachev said.

They noted the great significance of the 1987 intermediate nuclear force treaty, signed by the leaders of the two countries, which began the process of real nuclear disarmament.

Reagan noted that perestroyka processes find support and sympathy with U.S. political and public circles. The Soviet democratisation and practical steps towards new forms of political and economic activity help destroy old stereotypes in the United States and give birth to the feeling of friendship and readiness to develop diverse contacts and exchanges.

Reagan said there were periods of great tension and uncertainty at turning points of U.S. history, but these periods were successfully overcome by the U.S. people, because differences were resolved by methods that satisfied all society, and reason finally prevailed over passion.

Reagan said he was sure the Soviet Union will overcome the period of instability, because as a result of its reforms, it had chosen the right road.

They discussed the development of situation in Europe, the Gulf crisis and other international issues.

Holds Talks With Lukyanov

LD1709165690 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov met former U.S. President Ronald Reagan in the Kremlin today.

Reagan is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Gorbachev.

During the conversation, Lukyanov briefed Reagan on the main directions of Soviet economic and political reform, the activity of the Supreme Soviet, the work on new bills now under consideration by the Soviet legislature. He praised Reagan's constructive contribution to the development of Soviet-American relations.

Reagan said U.S. politicians and the public were greatly interested in perestroyka and democratization in the

Soviet Union, which helped overcome old stereotypes and strengthened readiness to develop comprehensive contacts and exchanges.

He expressed satisfaction with the fact that a number of agreements signed by the Soviet Union and the United States during his term of office in the White House, have formed the solid basis for new interrelations between the two countries.

Reagan and Lukyanov exchanged views on the Persian Gulf crisis and some other international issues of mutual interest.

Ryzhkov Scheduled To Address U.S., Soviet Lawyers

LD1709144890 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Legal aspects of Soviet-American economic cooperation will be considered at a conference of jurists from the two countries from September 19-21 in Moscow.

The conference is expected to be attended by nearly 3,000 lawyers, business people and representatives of public and state organisations of the two countries.

The proposal to hold the conference was made to the Soviet Lawyers Union by the American non-governmental organisation "People to People", of which the U.S. President is honorary chairman.

Another American non-governmental organisation—the U.S. Center for International Cooperation—then took over. It joined forces with the USSR Lawyers' Union and the USSR Ministry of Justice as the main organisers of the forum.

The organising committee's American section includes former U.S. Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford and former Secretaries of State George Shultz and Cyrus Vance.

The opening session of the conference is expected to be addressed by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. The plenary meeting will take place on the same day. It will be addressed by Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov, Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin and Soviet Minister of Justice Veniamin Yakovlev.

They will speak about the key political, economic and legal aspects of the Soviet Union's life and ways of resolving soviet domestic problems in line with world developments.

Lawyers from the two countries will then discuss specific legal subjects in four working groups, the supremacy of law and the role of Soviet and American jurists, the balance between society's interests and individual rights, law and contemporary global problems of mutual interest, Soviet-American economic relations and their legal basis.

The forthcoming forum will undoubtedly mark another practical step on the road towards more active Soviet-American economic relations, the level of which is not yet fully consistent with the level of mutual understanding reached in the Soviet-American political dialogue.

Discussions at the forum and their results will certainly be of practical importance to the legislation process both in the United States and the Soviet Union and will contribute to the implementation of economic reform in the Soviet Union, putting the Soviet economy on a market basis.

Participants will analyse international human rights documents and their reflection in national legislations.

China

Chinese Communist Party Member Arrives in Moscow

LD1709130690 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—A delegation of the Chinese Communist Party led by alternate member of the Chinese Communist Party Politburo Ding Guangen arrived in Moscow today under a plan of relations between the communist parties of the two countries.

New Ambassador Appointed to China 14 Sep

LD1409142390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 14 Sep (TASS)—It is officially reported here today that Nikolay Solovyev has been appointed USSR ambassador to the People's Republic of China and released from the duties of USSR ambassador to Japan. Oleg Troyanovskiy is released from the duties of USSR ambassador to the PRC in view of his retirement on pension.

Nikolay Solovyev, born 1931, is Russian. In 1957 he completed his studies at the Moscow State Institute of International Affairs of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1971-86 he was head of sector, deputy head of department, and head of the Second Far East Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry. In 1986-90 he was USSR ambassador to Japan.

Business Cooperation Contracts Signed in Beijing

LD1709175690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1037 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Excerpt] Beijing, 17 Sep (TASS)—Documents signed during the visit to the PRC by a delegation from Soviet business circles envisage the formation in the Soviet Union of joint enterprises for building materials, the building of a number of production lines to make goods for victims of the Chernobyl accident, erection of high-class hotels, and organization of business schools in Moscow and Beijing, with branches in Khabarovsk and Harbin. The delegation was headed by B.S. Bushuyev, president of the USSR interbranch scientific-technological association for economics of the construction complex, and D.I. Kondrashov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic deputy minister for construction in northern and western regions.

The plans, which are intended to be implemented in the near future, will be carried out in cooperation with leading Beijing construction companies which erected numerous facilities for the 11th Asiatic Games in the PRC capital.

Today, at a time when the Soviet Union and China have decided on a partial transfer to reciprocal payments in hard currency, and both countries are feeling a lack of currency resources, joint enterprises are the most promising form of cooperation. First and foremost, this concerns the construction industry. As is known, the majority of the 15,000 PRC citizens living in the USSR are employed in this industry. By the end of last year, the Soviet Union and China had signed 95 contracts for provision of labor services, and 44 agreements on joint enterprises, with a total volume of investment of $240 million. The new accords wil bring a considerable rise in these figures. [passage omitted]

Trade, Industry Exhibition in Beijing Ends

LD1609212390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1311 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Summary] Beijing, 16 Sep (TASS)—Over 100 protocols and contracts worth over 20 million Swiss francs were signed during an exhibition of Soviet trade and industry, which was held in Beijing 3-16 September. Forty-five foreign trade organizations, as well as several joint enterprises and cooperatives took part. There were over 2,000 exhibits of industrial output, scientific and technical developments, consumer goods, and medical preparations on show. Around 90,000 people visited the exhibition.

Northeast Asia

RSFSR Minister Receives Mongolian Official

LD1709195190 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Russian Federation Foreign Minister Vladimir Vinogradov today met Buhen, governor of China's Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region, staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Russian Government.

The sides discussed prospects for the development of versatile relations between the Soviet Union's largest republic, particularly its far eastern areas, and Inner Mongolia.

They pointed to the existence of good possibilities for further developing mutually advantageous cooperation in economy, science, culture and sports.

New Mongolian President Ochirbat Profiled

PM1709114590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 90 Second Edition p 7

[By PRAVDA correspondent V. Sapov portrait of the new Mongolian president, Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat, under the rubric "Portrait Against the Background of News"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—The structural changes in Mongolia's upper echelons of power have culminated in the institution of a presidency. The new president is 48-year-old Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat, who comes from Dzavhan Aymag and worked as chairman of the People's Great Hural before he was elected president.

Wearing a white deli (the national dress) and a tall round hat edged with sable fur, he strode into the People's Great Hural sessions hall to take his oath.

P. Ochirbat's rapid rise is largely explained by the political situation that has taken shape in the country and the complete change of leadership. Mongolian society needs more dynamic politicians and enterprising leaders of all levels and ranks. In my opinion, Ochirbat was no accidental choice.

I have talked to him and listened to his speeches on more than one occasion. He is a sociable man and does not evade difficult questions. He loves to discuss things with journalists. He takes an optimistic view of current political events, which was reaffirmed in his first speech as president. In it he expressed confidence that, with its accumulated potential, the country will extricate itself from crisis and embark on a path of progress.

"Life will never forgive us if we Mongolians, with our ancient traditions of statehood, waste time on fruitless discussions instead of productive work and real action," he said, addressing the deputy corps.

I also remember his words about national unity being the foundation of the state and about reviving national culture. To all appearances, the new president takes a firm stand on the questions of establishing law and order, organization, and discipline. His readiness to cooperate with all parties and movements is well known.

Mongolia's "New Democrats" recently accused him of being too harsh in his assessment of their actions and even of rejecting them outright. Subsequent events have shown, however, that the People's Great Hural has taken quite clear, principled action in the conditions of confrontation. The official authorities have in fact adopted all reasonable proposals made by the coalition of democratic forces: with regard to the law on elections, improvement in society's political structure, and the development of market relations.

Keen competition between all six political parties, as well as social organizations, was a feature of the recent elections in Mongolia. In the end, an impressive victory was secured by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, of which the new president is a member. With 422 parliamentary seats available, as many as 367 of its members were elected as People's Great Hural deputies, while the Democratic Party secured 16 seats, the Progressive Party—six seats, and the Social Democratic Party—four seats. Incidentally, the opposition also supported the nomination of P. Ochirbat for this high post. The public regards this step as a sincere desire to resolve disputes through compromise and a rallying of forces.

So, the Mongolian president has taken up office. A new chairman of the People's Great Hural has been elected. Next on the agenda is the election of a standing parliament: the Small Hural. A new government, constitutional oversight council, and other administrative institutions have also to be formed. It is important that this structure works to full capacity. In this respect, much depends on the president and his team.

Shevardnadze's Visit to DPRK Examined

SK1809080290 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Report on an article by (Galina Sidrova), political commentator for NOVOYE VREMYA—read by announcer]

[Excerpts] NOVOYE VREMYA, a Soviet weekly magazine, carried an article by its correspondent, (Galina Sidrova), who accompanied Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze when he recently visited some Far Eastern countries.

We will carry a summary of this article. [passage omitted]

Pyongyang: The leader's 20-meter-high bronze statue stands high in this city.

The DPRK Foreign Ministry officials who accompanied us said that 99.9 percent of the North Korean people are absolutely happy.

The reporter for NOVOYE VREMYA, a weekly magazine, writes:

I believe what they said. The North Korean people are as happy as people who are forced to think that they are happy can be.

People appear to be asleep. They were put to sleep. I suddenly found them and us, who had been sleeping just like them, in the mirror of the times. Probably, we have not slept a sleep as horrific as people here are sleeping. [passage indistinct]

The talks in Pyongyang were very complicated. During the talks, the Soviet side notified the DPRK leadership that it was planning to establish diplomatic relations with South Korea.

Shevardnadze said to reporters: We will act as we deem necessary. Establishing diplomatic relations is a sovereign right of each state.

The Soviet Union welcomes a meeting between the premiers of North and South Korea, the demilitarization of the peninsula, and Korea's reunification. [passage omitted]

Japanese Officials' Visit to DPRK Previewed

SK1609013590 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] The Japanese Government has decided to send a joint delegation of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party and the Socialist Party to the DPRK 24-28 September, for the purpose of discussing ways to improve relations between the two countries.

This delegation will be led by former Deputy Prime Minister Shin Kanemaru, who is a famous politician. He will deliver Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu's personal letter to DPRK President Kim Il-song.

With regard to this, commentator Pedrov writes:

This visit will be a turning point in relations between Tokyo and Pyongyang. Currently, the DPRK is the only country that does not have diplomatic relations with Japan. This is of course an abnormal phenomenon between two neighboring countries. This is all the more so since, apart from the Soviet Union and China, Japan is the third largest trading partner with the People's Korea.

I would like to indicate that the history of relations between Japan and North Korea has always been complex. For example, in November 1983 and January 1988, the Japanese Government carried out various sanctions against Pyongyang.

While hesitating in deciding on whether to improve relations with the People's Korea, it seems that Tokyo decided to do so because of the changing situation on the Korean peninsula and the world over and because of the need to establish trust and constructive cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region.

According to reports, Toshiki Kaifu's personal letter includes an apology by Japan for the colonial rule of Korea 1910-1945 and the proposal to begin talks to settle the relations between the two countries without any preliminary conditions.

With regard to the official apology, I believe that this is definitely a belated apology. Also Japan's ASAHI SHIMBUN writes that under the pretext that Japan did not wage a war with Korea, it has no intention of discussing the issue of paying (?mental) and material compensation to Pyongyang for the past sufferings.

On the other hand, it is expected that Japan will make a concession in the field of developing economic cooperation.

From this position I cannot ascertain whether the DPRK will agree to this but I hope that this issue will not become a barrier in dialogue between Japan and North Korea.

The personal letter states that talks be held without attaching any preliminary conditions, which is usually the custom. Also, the many issues that have accumulated over the past 45 years between the two countries are being resolved, including the decision to simplify the Japanese Government's procedures concerning North Korean citizens' entry into Japan.

Also, both sides reached an agreement on mutually establishing an official mission, on joint use of Japan's up-to-date satellite, and more importantly, on the release of seamen of the Number 18 ship, "Fujisan Maru," by the North Korean authorities.

I would like to remind you that the seamen are the ship's captain and head mechanic, who were sentenced in December 1985 to 15 years of forced labor for having committed the crime of taking a citizen of the People's Korea on board and then sailing to Japan.

The desire of Tokyo and Pyongyang to achieve results in the talks by making compromises is apparent.

The outcome of the talks will have great significance in consolidating security in the Asian-Pacific region.

The normalization of relations between Japan and the DPRK will benefit all the countries of this region, will give a new impetus to the settlement of the situation on the Korean peninsula; and will be a guarantee that the past will never be repeated.

Yazov Meets With Japanese Journalists

LD1709135990 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Member of the Presidential Council and Soviet Defence Minister Marshal Dmitry Yazov met today a delegation of editors and political analysts of Japanese newspapers that is now staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY.

He told the Japanese guests that a defensive military doctrine was being implemented in the course of the current military reform. Yazov outlined the Soviet stand on problems of settling regional conflicts, on turning the Asian-Pacific region into a zone of peace and establishing a new all-embracing system of international security.

The Soviet defence minister replied to journalists' questions.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Talks on U.S.-Philippines Bases Previewed

HK1809062790 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] The forthcoming bases talks scheduled for next week are important for the future of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. It will be recalled that the agreement terminates next year. If both parties fail to enter into a new treaty, the bases will have to go. What solutions would be acceptable to both countries? This would depend on how Washington faces its financial obligation on the bases. Records show the Philippines' income from the bases reaches $1 billion annually. But, in past years there were some problems in the regularity of the revenues. The U.S. Congress passed a resolution cutting $90 million from the total military aid to the Philippines, thus leaving only $481 million. Manila received this with a cold shoulder. Richard Armitage's role as the U.S. panel's chief negotiator would not be easy. He has to convince Manila that the bases' rent is guaranteed. Another problem is the Philippines' jurisdiction over the military bases. In the past U.S. soldiers enjoyed immunity, and they can easily leave the Philippines if they are accused of crimes. This has compounded the ire of the Filipinos against the military bases.

In March, the Supreme Court issued a decision that U.S. soldiers and civilians assigned to the military bases are under the jurisdiction of Philippine laws. However, many Filipinos remain concerned, and they want a concrete mechanism regarding the control of the bases. The government should also have jurisdiction over its military operations, i.e. the current Middle East situation. Many Philippine authorities believe the government is not aware of the movements in the military bases. Operations in Subic and Clark have escalated because they are the sources of supplies to the Persian Gulf.

In view of these events, authorities of both countries have not issued any statement or explanation. It is normal that some sectors of society question these moves as violations of the Philippines' sovereignty. Thus, groups opposed to the bases' retention have a stronger bargaining position, and it is even more clear to them that the Philippines' future is dependent on another country's intentions.

The involuntary involvement in the military operations of another country has a negative effect. The fate of the many Filipinos working in Iraq and Kuwait is at stake; they are stranded there as a result of the gulf crisis.

In spite of the good relations of the Philippines with the United States, the nonaligned nations had a negative reaction to the Philippines' stand on the issue. The Philippines is an observer in this international group. Will this situation last while the military bases remain? Even if a new treaty is forged, the term will not be extended. [passage as heard] The Philippines is expected to propose the closure of Clark Air Base following the termination of the present treaty next year, while it will propose that the Subic Naval Base will continue to remain for three more years.

On the part of Washington, it will propose the commercial use of these facilities. Meanwhile, the Philippines' Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a resolution calling for the closure of Camp John Hay and Wallace Air Station regardless of the results of the talks.

The majority of the Philippine Senate is opposed to the retention of the military bases. According to the senators, since the Soviet Union and the United States no longer consider themselves foes in the Asian region, there is no need for the military bases to remain. Even if there is a new treaty, the Philippine Senate still has the last word. The constitution stipulates that a two-thirds vote of the senators would ratify any agreement entered into by the government.

Near East & South Asia

Saudi Foreign Minister Continues Visit

Meets With Gorbachev 17 Sep

LD1709163890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] In connection with the forthcoming restoration of full diplomatic relations, the USSR president met Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, Saudi Arabian minister of foreign affairs, in the Kremlin today. The latter delivered a message from King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz Al Sa'ud.

The meeting marked both states' readiness to bring their interaction within the framework of profound positive changes in the world based upon the principles of freedom of choice, equal rights, sovereignty, and balance of interests. The restoration of relations during the crisis in the Arab east shows both states' determination to cooperate with other members of the international community and to strive consistently and unswervingly for the implementation of the UN Security Council's resolution on the Persian Gulf.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal examined the development of the situation, discussed possible behavior of the aggressor and those who oppose him, and viewed ways of attaining the goals set forth in UN resolutions.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev asked the Prince to convey greetings to the Saudi king and the people of Saudi Arabia. He expressed hope for vigorous developments of large-scale bilateral relations of benefit to both countries and in the interests of settling the region's problems and toward international improvement.

Shevardnadze, Mandi, and Jindan [names as heard] took part in the meeting.

Confers With Shevardnadze

LD1809093590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 18 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Sep (TASS)—An official report on yesterday's meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister S. al-Faysal, who is on a visit to the Soviet Union, has been published here today.

The sides' attention focused on the complete normalization of Soviet-Saudi relations. Having spoken highly of the political dialogue which has been established between the Soviet Union and Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the governments of the two countries the ministers came out in favor of exchanging diplomatic missions at ambassadorial level. A separate communique was agreed upon.

E. Shevardnadze described this step by the two states as the result of the new political thinking which is having increasing influence on world affairs and international relations. The Saudi side noted the significance of Soviet-Saudi relations in resolving regional problems of the Near East.

In discussing the crisis in the Persian Gulf the sides favored settling it very rapidly by political and diplomatic means on the basis of Iraq's fulfilling the relevant UN Security Council resolutions. In this connection the ministers were resolute in their support for unreserved restoration of the national independence, state sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Kuwait. This aim can be implemented only by the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from the territory of Kuwait.

The conversations took particular note of the need to intensify the efforts of Arab states which could make a substantial contribution to settling the crisis.

The interlocutors expressed satisfaction with the friendly atmoshere in which the conversations were held and with the results of their meeting. They agreed to maintain regular contacts at the level of the leadership of the Soviet Union and Saudi Arabi in connection with the situation in the Persian Gulf and the Near East as a whole with a view to strengtening interaction between the two countries in setting up regional security structures and elaborating measures to establish peace and security in the region.

Announces Resumption of Ties

LD1709205990 Riyadh Television Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Excerpts] A Saudi Arabian-Soviet statement was released on 17 September which reads as follows:

The USSR and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, proceeding from their desire to develop cordial relations between them in the interest of the peoples of the two states, decided on 17 September 1990 to resume the exchange of diplomatic representation at ambassadorial level.

The two sides agreed that their bilateral relations will be built in accordance with the UN Charter on the bases of peaceful coexistence, equality, and mutual respect for the sovereignty and the safety of their territories, and of noninterference in the domestic affairs of each other.

The USSR and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia will make active efforts to settle regional disputes, and to develop international cooperation and strengthen peace and security in the world.

Today, in the Kremlin, President Mikhail Gorbachev received His Royal Highness Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, who is currently visiting Moscow. The official statement released after the meeting, which was carried by Moscow radio, says that the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the USSR at this moment of acute crisis in the Arabian Gulf area affirms the resolution of the two states to work firmly for the implementation of the Security Council resolutions concerning the situation in the Arabian Gulf.

The statement adds that President Gorbachev and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal discussed possible solutions which would realize the objectives contained in these resolutions. The Soviet president expressed his desire for intensive development of the extensive bilateral relations between the two countries, which will serve the interests of the two countries and the interests of settling the issues of the Arabian Gulf area crisis. [passage omitted]

Today, at 0900 Saudi time, His Royal Highness Prince Saudi al-Faysal arrived at the headquarters of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, where he was welcomed by His Excellency the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and high-ranking officials in the Foreign Ministry. Lengthy talks were held, with the Soviet side chaired by Eduard Shevardnadze, the Soviet foreign minister. The meeting discussed the situation in the Gulf, the implementation of the Security Council resolutions concerning the Iraqi invasion of sisterly Kuwait, and the return of the situation to normal. The talks also tackled the development of bilateral relations and the resumption of ties. Shevardnadze said in this context that this step is a big event. [passage omitted]

Later Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal made the following statement:

[Begin recording] We tackled bilateral relations during our meeting. There is total agreement regarding the issue of developing permanent and normal relations between the two countries. We will together put this agreement to his excellency the president [Gorbachev] in one hour. As his excellency the minister has said, we are sure that the custodian of the two holy mosques and his excellency the president are willing to resume bilateral and diplomatic relations between the two countries.

We also tackled the issue of the hour, which is the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. There was total agreement in analyzing the situation and in stressing the necessity of resolving the situation quickly through the Iraqi forces' withdrawal from Kuwait and the return of its legitimacy. The international community, and the Soviet Union and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, want these matters solved peacefully. However, at the same time, the two countries thnk that the Security Council resolutions must be implemented with precision and firmness.

We hope that Iraq, faced with this international unanimity, based on legitimacy, will agree to the implementation of international will and will withdraw quickly and unconditionally from Kuwait and allow the return of legitimacy.

I can stress that the two countries have agreed to exert every effort to cooperate within the framework of the implementation of international resolutions to this effect. [end recording]

Today at 0200, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received His Royal Highness Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, the foreign minister. The meeting was attended by Soviet foreign minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and was characterized by its friendly atmosphere. During this meeting the results of the talks of the foreign ministers of the Kingdom and of the Soviet Union were reviewed and agreed on.

Meets With Primakov on Gulf

LD1709143290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)—Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, today received Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, foreign minister of Saudi Arabia, at the latter's request.

In their talk they discussed issues of bilateral relations and of the situation in the Persian Gulf.

Sees 'Positive' Soviet Role

LD1709193190 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev]

[Text] Abu Dhabi September 17 TASS—Saudi Arabia highly assesses "the positive role played by the Soviet Union in ensuring security and stability in the world in general and the Middle East in particular," Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal said in an interview with the OKAZ newspaper on Sunday.

The Kingdom believes "the time is now more opportune than ever to set up active and effective ties between the two countries." This will serve justice, peace and security and be a contribution to [word indistinct] the two countries' vital interests, he said.

The Saudi minister said President Mikhail Gorbachev is a "leader of a new type, wishing prosperity and stability for the whole world." He said Saudi Arabia had similar aims.

Saudi Arabian policy bases on the development of balanced relations with all states in the interest of international cooperation on the basis of the principles of mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs, the prince said.

Gulf Crisis as 'Turning Point'

LD1709135490 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Commentary by Oleg Shchedrov]

[Text] The Soviet Union and Saudi Arabia have reestablished diplomatic relations. This decision was reached on the first day of the visit by the Saudi Arabia foreign minister, Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud, to Moscow. Oleg Shchedrov comments.

The idea of the necessity to normalize relations between Moscow and Riyadh has been in the air for some time. The contacts between the two capitals have significantly increased since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. However, even after that the relations remained somewhat cool for, naturally, many years of regarding each other watchfully and standing on different sides of the barricades of global confrontation could not help but interfere with taking a positive step towards meeting each other.

The Gulf crisis became the turning point here. The stand taken by Moscow against the Iraqi agression in Kuwait helped to dispel the mistrust between Moscow and Riyadh. From the pragmatic point of view the situation required practical interactions between the two sides, and this was unthinkable without normal diplomatic relations.

It seems to me the fact that Moscow and Washington have ended the cold war and that Washington ceased to regard good relations its allies had with Moscow as criminal has also played its role. As a result, leaving for Moscow the Saudi foreign minister said: On seeing the positive role the Soviet Union has played in supporting security and stability in the world and in the Middle East in particular, I believe there is no better time than now for establishing active and effective ties between our two countries.

By the way, the term establishing, even reestablishing diplomatic formalities between Moscow and Riyadh requires explanation. Moscow was the first European country to recognize Saudi Arabia back in 1926. Up to the end of the 1930s there was a Soviet embassy in Saudi Arabia. It was then closed more due to Moscow's internal policies than to some sort of bilateral reasons. Officially since that time our relations have not been broken or suspended so in the legal sense they do not need to be re-established. Be that as it may, the time has long been ripe for the normalization of Soviet-Saudi relations, and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal Al Sa'ud's visit to Moscow should put all in its right place.

Foreign Ministry Consultations Held With Israel

LD1709175990 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Experts from the Soviet and Israeli Foreign Ministries held consultations in Moscow on September 14.

The consultations were held "in the context of preparations for a meeting of the two countries' foreign ministers, to be held in New York during the work of the 45th U.N. General Assembly session," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS.

Soviet and Israeli experts discussed the situation in the Middle East and other issues of mutual interest, he said.

They noted that "the Gulf crisis has made clear the need to resolve immediately all other conflicts in the region, first and foremost, the Arab-Israeli conflict."

They agreed there is "an urgent need to create regional security structures and work out measures to facilitate the establishment of peace and stability for all Middle East peoples," the spokesman said.

Deputy Foreign Minister Arrives in Tehran

LD1809082190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 18 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Ravil Musin]

[Text] Tehran, 18 Sep (TASS)—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.M. Belonogov arrived in the Iranian capital.

He told TASS in an interview that he would discuss with Iranian officials topical issues regarding the Persian Gulf zone situation, a situation that remains very strained and explosive. The Soviet representative said there is an urgent need to discuss this problem with Iran, a country which has considerable weight in the region.

The USSR deputy foreign minister said the state of bilateral relations, their prospects and problems would also be examined.

Examining the views of Iran and the Soviet Union are essential to settling the Persian Gulf crisis, Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Mahmud Va'ezi said in an interview with the TASS correspondent. We, therefore, welcome this visit, he stressed, and we hope to examine all topical issues during the forthcoming negotiations with the Soviet side.

Commentaries Review, Assess Persian Gulf Crisis

Eyewitness Account in Kuwait

90UF0536A Moscow SOBESEDNIK in Russian No 36 Sep 90 p 11

[Statements by Soviet oil-refinery construction workers evacuated from Kuwait, reported by Viktor Paryugin; place and date not given: "Kuwait—A Trampled Paradise"]

[Text] **War Through the Eyes of Eyewitnesses**

Were it not for the aggression of Iraq and the evacuation of our countrymen, it would be a long time before we knew what kind of country Kuwait is—or, more accurately, what kind of country it was. Today a lot is being written about Kuwait's lost independence. Just like life—when there was a man no one could recall. Then he died, and everybody assembled—acquaintances and nonacquaintances. Masses of flowers. Everyone is writing about Kuwait, but that does not make it any easier for the country. Today with the help of two of our specialists, who were working on construction of an oil-refining complex, we will try to delve into prewar Kuwait and occupied Kuwait. And so, we hear from Dmitriy Tyshchenko, an engineer, and Konstantin Lyalin, a rigger, who returned to the Soviet Union with the second group of people evacuated.

Prewar Kuwait

[Lyalin] When I flew into Kuwait in April of this year, I was greeted by a mass of impressions. The international airport—a huge palace. Bright, spacious, beautiful. Devoid of people—nothing like what we see in our airports, with people sleeping side by side. All arriving foreigners would undergo a medical inspection to check for any possible diseases, including AIDS. Fingerprints were taken in the event some kind of crime took place. But crime here was a rarity. When we arrived, just four persons were in local jails throughout the entire country—three of these for profiteering in alcoholic beverages. The country had about two million residents, of which 6-700,000 were indigenous Kuwaitis and the remainder were foreign workers who did everything: collect the trash, serve in the army, work for the police, engage in construction and trade. The Kuwaitis were the hosts. They were in no hurry. Almost everyone had a car, from 12-year old lad to little old lady. They would even leave their cars unlocked outside their homes. You could tell who the owner of a car was from the license plate. Four digits indicated a non-Kuwaiti, three—a Kuwaiti, two—someone close to the amir, and one—a relative of the amir.

The country was rich, clean, peaceful. The houses not high-rise—ranging from two to five floors. There was a mosque on each block, and none other like it. Each house had a shop, which conducted business from six in the morning until midnight. If you did not manage to get your food from the supermarket, you could go there. Kuwaitis wore their national clothing—a white outer garment and two rings on the head, worn even when the young fellows played soccer.

[Tyshchenko] There were very solid social programs in Kuwait. Medical treatment was free for all residents, although foreigners went to certain polyclinics and indigenous Kuwaitis to others. On several occasions I went for dental treatment. Each patient was treated with respect and attention, and fillings were accompanied by a 10-15 year guarantee. The hospitals themselves were spacious and clean—no one stood in line. When one of our workers had an accident, falling from a reservoir, he said later that he did not have it as nice at home as he did in the hospital. Sheets were changed every day. The rooms were clean. There was always fresh fruit on the tables.

At one time the government adopted a program for providing housing to the indigenous population. As a result, almost everyone obtained a separate house—a splendid villa. The Kuwaitis are a very religious people. They pray five times a day, according to practice instituted by their ancestors. Prior to prayer they are required to wash their hands and the soles of their feet. One must be clean to converse with Allah. If there were no water nearby, they would use sand to wipe their hands. Wherever Kuwaitis were—on the road, at work—they spread out their prayer rug and made their bows to the southwest, toward Mecca.

How War Began

[Lyalin] From 0400 on 2 August I worked on shift at the facility. At about 0700 two helicopters flew overhead, apparently Iraqi. One of them was shot down right in front of our eyes and crashed not far from where we were working. At this point the Kuwaiti engineer in charge of the construction took responsibility upon himself and gave the order to cease operations and evacuate. The sound of gunfire could be heard in the city. As I passed by our relay station, I noticed two holes in the frame of the building. All of our equipment remained at the construction sites—cranes, vehicles. As it turned out, we never did return.

This was not war the way I understood it. There was firing from time to time. I do not believe in Kuwaiti resistance—they had a hired army, police as well. The Kuwaitis themselves were not the kind of people to run around with weapons.

How Kuwait Changed After the Iraqi Invasion

[Lyalin] The first thing that hit you was the fact that there were lines in the stores and trash on the streets. Prior to the war, of course, this would have been inconceivable. I went out into the city after two days or so, and saw that all the stores had been looted.

[Tyshchenko] The way I saw things, what happened first was destruction of the jewelry stores, then the stores owned by Japanese firms selling radioelectronic equipment. At the end of our stay here, they even got to the supermarkets. Prices had risen again, but not by much. Muslims have a custom according to which it is a sin to get rich on someone else's misfortune.

Reaction of Soviet People to the Beginning of Military Action

[Tyshchenko] There was no terror. None of our people were wounded. We heard firing in the distance but bullets did not fly toward our windows. I noticed that shooting began two hours after it grew dark. There was firing for about five minutes, then quiet once again.

I knew that this was indeed war when I saw two Iraqi soldiers at an intersection about a kilometer from where we lived. They were lying in a pool of blood. One was still moving, but apparently it was too late. Soldiers standing there did not even try to help him. A patrol vehicle was nearby, covered with bullet holes.

I did not get a detailed picture of this—we were passing by in a bus, going for food. These bodies flashed in front of my eyes and I felt not quite myself. For several days we did not know when they would get us out of there, and what we could take with us. During the first days, a plan for evacuation by sea was being worked out. The chief engineer spoke to us and stated we could take not more than 20 kilograms of dry cargo—the rest would have to stay behind. People were angry and resentful. To work under hot climatic conditions, not see your own people, and not be able to take anything home!

The atmosphere in the collective was normal—we watched the "Vremya" program on the "Orbita" system, and in the evenings discussed the possibilities along which events might develop. We followed all the news and tried to guess what would happen....

[Lyalin] The first thing we did was store up water—filled up all the containers we had in the house. There was no running water as we have in our country—water was delivered to each house in large volume. Then we went around to the shops and stores spending money. We bought a one-month food supply. Then we searched for places to purchase radioelectronic equipment. We knew, after all, that such an opportunity happens once in a lifetime, and you will not acquire anything in the USSR. The most difficult thing in such situations is experiencing the sensation of uncertainty. There were some who lost their temper, responding to jokes with malice, or panicking, saying, look, they have forgotten us.

How People Conducted Themselves in Difficult Situations

[Tyshchenko] I will not say the situation was extreme. But everyone was afraid the supply of electricity would be cut off. Then the air conditioners and refrigerators would go out and people would be tormented by the intolerable heat. Fortunately, this did not happen. But people showed their true colors even under such acceptable conditions. Informal leaders emerged during the organization of one job or another—listing how much people had in the way of possessions, who was accompanied by family and who not. Many of our people were left with an unpleasant taste in their mouths following the behavior of Dzyunenko, secretary of the party organization, and Aytakayev, chief of the construction directorate in Kuwait. Neither one had family here, but departed nonetheless in the first group of evacuees, which included women, children, families, and those whose guest visas had expired. Of course, they may have been directed to leave first, but our men were angry that people entrusted with authority, on whom decision-making and organization of the evacuation depended, had left us.

How the Iraqi Soldiers Behaved in Occupied Kuwait

[Tyshchenko] My windows opened out onto the highway, and I saw all the troop movements. The way I perceive it, after the main skirmishes were over, the well-trained units that accomplished the seizure of Kuwait were moved to the border with Saudi Arabia, and either volunteers or mobilized troops arrived to take their place. Among them were middle-aged and old men, as well as very young lads. Each was dressed in his own way—in a brand new Kuwaiti uniform fresh from the factory, but without distinguishing patches, or in the blue rigger overalls. I even saw one in a rigger's helmet. But all carried automatic weapons.

Conversing with local inhabitants standing in line for food, I heard of incidents of looting and plundering of citizens and stores, incidents of assault. I did not see any of this myself and do not care to expound on this topic. Saddam Husayn reacts quite abnormally to criticism, and our people remain in Iraq.

[Lyalin] I did not see it, but it seems to me Iraqis were looting the stores and shops at night, and firing shots as a warning, as if they were skirmishing with someone. Then in the morning the unskilled laborers would come out, trash collectors—Filipinos and Sri Lankans—and pick up what remained. [end Lyalin]

...There is nothing in Kuwait except oil and sand. But—in addition to oil and sand—we have land capable of generously yielding bread, and diamonds.... And we have plants that produce tanks, tanks which are today roaming the streets of Kuwait City.

Kuwait was a beautiful country. It is sad that now there is one less civilized paradise left in the world.

Dangers of Buildup Seen

LD1709173190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Commentary by Yevgeniy Grachev]

[Text] Today marks exactly a month and a half since news agencies reported a dramatic piece of news: Iraqi troops had crossed the Kuwaiti border and were heading toward the capital of that small Arab state. Since then, the military have had no rest, diplomats have been racking their brains, and the heads of states and governments of many countries have been engaged in constant consultations.

It is difficult to calculate now how many states have been involved in some way or another in the whirl of events that emerged on 2 August this year. One can only assume with confidence that the number of these countries is continuously growing. As regards military activity in the region, it has surpassed by far all notions of reasonable sufficiency. After all, statements by any general should be taken seriously. True, staking on force is not only a typical position of the military but also a logical one, otherwise, they could hardly be called generals. The crux of the matter lies elsewhere. The situation has attained such a degree of tension that any careless step by any of the sides of the confrontation can result in a most powerful explosion with unpredicatable consequences. Therefore, the question of the need to resolve the crisis by nonviolent peaceful means is arising again and again.

In principle, a good deal has been done for this purpose. The world community has applied tough economic and political sanctions, something which is not painless for Baghdad. The sanctions can be extended and Iraq is very well aware of that. Therefore, one can hardly find explanations for the Iraqi authorities's statement refusing to accept the clauses of the resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council. Such statements, however, can be heard and, perhaps, make their own destructive contribution to the war of nerves which has been underway for already a month and a half.

Will the war change to real military antagonism? According to news reports coming from both sides, the generals are ready for such a course of events. High-ranking diplomats do not exclude such an option, either. One believes, however, that the efforts of the world community and of responsible political figures in various countries are not focused on this. For example, during the Sunday telephone conversation between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand they stressed once again that nothing but a peaceful solution to the conflict on the basis of strict compliance with the UN Security Council's resolutions is seen acceptable. We can add to this, that somewhat earlier, the Soviet leadership emphasized that the USSR not only intends to carry out strictly all the decisions of the world community but also was prepared to opt for further toughening of the sanctions if circumstances required that. For the time being, however, clouds continue to gather over the Persian Gulf. More and more contingents of troops are arriving in the area of conflict. A storm can break out at any moment. The main thing is to prevent it from happening.

Opposition to Iraq 'Unshakable'

LD1709204690 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Commentary by TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov: "Situation in the Gulf"]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—A new joint move is in the offing. After the Soviet Union and the United States jointly comdemned Iraq's aggression during the Helsinki summit and similar statements were made during the Moscow-Paris and Moscow-Rome talks, plans are being made for a joint Euro-Soviet declaration on the Middle East which is due to confirm the determination of different states to unswervingly follow the U.N. Security Council resolutions on the crisis.

The declaration is expected to be signed at the United Nations Headquarters in New York in late September during a meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and his colleagues from twelve European Community member-countries.

Without seeking to divine the specific content of the declaration, one can say with a great degree of certainty that the document will be yet another impressive proof of the international community's firm intention to use all political means to resolve the dangerous international crisis caused by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

One can state with certainty that the front of opposition to the aggressor is gaining new strength, and the field of multilateral activities, aiming to uphold international legal norms trampled by Baghdad, is expanding.

It is noteworthy that Arab World countries are being increasingly involved in the search for ways of resolving the crisis, along with the Soviet Union, the United States, West European countries and Japan.

A joint conference by a number of West European and Arab countries is due to convene in Venice in early October to discuss ways of ensuring security in the Mediterranean and Middle East region.

It was noted in Moscow and other capitals that Iran's Supreme National Security Council favoured respect for the U.N. Security Council's resolution.

All this shows that the aggressor can no longer act with impunity in the modern world.

However, although Iraq should have no doubts left as to the international community's determination to oppose its policy of fait accompli with relation to Kuwait, Baghdad is not yet viewing the situation with due sobriety.

There is no other explanation of the fact that Iraq not only continues to occupy Kuwait but openly seeks to turn that sovereign country into an object of shameless plunder.

It can hardly be viewed as anything else but a challenge to the world community that Iraq captured and continues to hold hostages and attacks foreign diplomatic offices in Kuwait.

The Iraqi propaganda is stubbornly reiterating the allegation that the mounting military presence in the Middle East is fraught with a serious threat to the Arab World. True, even more foriegn troops keep arriving in the region, not only from the United States.

A British armoured brigade is urgently getting ready to relocate to Saudi Arabia from West Germany. French mechanised units will soon follow suit. The Clemenceau aircraft carrier is sailing towards Saudi shores with a batch of combat helicopters on board.

Chairman of the European Community Commission Jacques Delors has announced the need to create the European Community's rapid deployment forces.

Clearly, the higher level of arms is not a factor capable of strengthening security in the region per se. But the main thing, the basic thing is to be sought elsewhere. Military-political measures by different states, no matter what they look like in isolation from each other, have a common denominator when taken together: They were provoked by Iraq and were intended as a response to Iraq's actions and statements. "Baghdad acts in a way that leaves the impression that the Iraqi president wishes to test how great is the international community's readiness to resist and take retaliatory measures," LE MONDE said today.

There is every ground to say—developing the idea—that if the Iraqi leadership really intends to arrange a test of this kind, it may find out that the determination of the majority of countries to oppose aggression is unshakable.

Another thing is, however, no less important: Whatever the motifs behind the Iraqi leadership's actions, they objectively provoke stronger retaliation, step up tension and endanger the peace in the region and the national interests of Iraq itself to an ever greater degree.

Is this the real intention of Baghdad?

Will people there be able to curb their own hegemonic ambitions and heed the voice of reason? As long as not all bridges have been burned down, the world has the right to hope for the better.

Iraq Seen as 'Hostage to Events'

PM1709213190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 4-5

[By Yuriy Glukhov under the "Journalist's Notes" rubric: "Persian Gulf: Logic of the Absurd"]

[Text] Which will prevail? Legality or illegality? International law or the law of the jungle? Sense or senselessness? These are the questions currently on the agenda in connection with the crisis in the Gulf created by Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. It is natural that they occupied an equally important place at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Helsinki, were reflected in the two presidents' joint statement, and are dominating reports on international affairs.

However much people may try to claim that this conflict is just an inter-Arab "squabble," what is happening in the Persian Gulf is not a local event. And it is not just a question of the world economy's being tied to Iraqi or Kuwaiti oil.

There are far more serious concerns.

It is impermissible when an independent state's sovereignty is flouted, its territory occupied, and an independent UN member is declared to be some kind of province.

It is criminal when the practice is cultivated of turning other countries' civilians into hostages.

It is monstrous when people talk about the use of chemical weapons—which mankind has been striving to outlaw—as something natural.

It is tragic when weapons provided for defense become instruments of aggression.

Of course, there is an explanation for everything. Here in the Near East the world is reaping the fruits of its past policy. For instance, the fruits of complacency toward the fate of war-torn Lebanon. The overlooking of the rights of the Palestinians, whose state was stifled at birth. And the fact that Palestinian lands were initially in the hands not only of Israel but of its Arab neighbors should also provide sad food for thought on the possible fate of Kuwait.

Something else is obvious too. We recall how many people, ourselves included, were slow to react to that flagrant act of tyranny—the seizure of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. Yet that set a dangerous precedent for the flouting of diplomatic immunity and the taking of hostages—when the hostage-takers were not some terrorist group but an entire state. Now the same thing is happening again, but on an incomparably larger scale.

Unfortunately, the world failed to sound the alarm even when the first reports emerged of gas attacks on the Iran-Iraq front and the use of toxins against Kurdish regions—all this in violation of the Geneva Convention. And here is the result—there is already talk of attempts to legalize chemical weapons.

The shortcomings of the policy of confrontation are obvious. These include the failure to carry out the UN resolutions on curbing Israeli aggression against the Arabs, which is being cited in Iraq. Yes, this did happen. But it does not mean that it should be the case in the future. All the more so since the catastrophic consequences of the Iraqi aggression are snowballing. Hundreds of thousands of people have become refugees awaiting evacuation. There is a threat of epidemic and starvation. The oil price has almost doubled on the world market, threatening to ruin oil-importing underdeveloped countries.

Colossal amounts of explosive material are being built up. There are already subunits from more than 25 countries in the conflict zone. The total concentration of troops is nearing the half-million mark. Half of them are Iraqi. Even Iraq is continuing to build up its forces, exposing the Iran-Iraq flank, where virtual fraternization is occurring. The U.S. corps in Saudi Arabia is also being increased from 100,000 to 150,000 men. Oman, the UAE, Qatar, and Bahrain are engaged in military preparations. There is already an entire flotilla of 70 warships from different countries in Gulf waters.

You can imagine the scale of the explosion should the conflict escalate into a war. According to assessments from the U.S. Joint Chiefs and National Security Council, U.S. losses alone in a large-scale war could be 20,000-30,000, taking account of Baghdad's possible use of chemical weapons. The disaster for the civilian population and the economic damage are simply unpredictable. In this connection the desire expressed in Helsinki to avert an armed conflict and find a political solution to the crisis deserves the most widespread support.

The persistent search for a peaceful solution is all the more necessary since the Gulf crisis is becoming oddly intertwined with the Arab-Israeli conflict, complicating an already complex situation. Iraq, for instance, is making the evacuation of Israeli troops from the occupied Palestinian lands one of the conditions for a withdrawal of its own troops from Kuwait. An original kind of logic! Imagine that during World War II the United States had occupied Britain and stated that it would leave misty Albion if Hitler's forces left Poland, for instance. Improbable?! Yes.

But this absurd logic and the cliche that, if you want to intimidate others, hit your own people first, produced a not entirely unambiguous reaction in the Arab East. Saddam Husayn's position is popular with the desperate Palestinian and Arab masses. The seizure of Kuwait is seen as being like the feat of Ali Baba in taking the treasure from the 40 thieves. Now these riches, they say, will be going to a good cause....

The active U.S. involvement in the Gulf crisis is a serious cause of alarm, nervousness, and suspicion among the Arab public. And there are grounds for it. The fact is that in a similar situation, when Israel occupied the Palestinian lands, the United States displayed not a hint of agitation or activity to ensure the triumph of justice. What's more, it took the aggressor's side.

Yet, let's be objective. Yes, the U.S. position as regards the Gulf crisis is not dictated by altruism. It is a question of defending its own interests and those of its allies. This position reflects the international community's position. Moreover, the Americans are in the trenches with Egyptians, Syrians, and Saudis. Finally, remembering the dirty war in Indochina, the U.S. public is warning that the United States should not be guided by commercial considerations. As John Miller, professor of political science at Rochester University, has noted, "It will be hard for the public to come to terms with the fact that American boys will be dying for stable oil prices. We should not have to write on a gravestone that a man died for a $25 barrel of oil."

I do not think that this is the time to doubt the sincerity of each other's intentions. A unique feature of this period is that the world community reacted as one to the flagrant violation of international law. And efforts should be made to preserve that reaction, to project it onto similar situations—including the Arab-Israeli conflict—to develop a regional security system, and to prepare for the convening of an international conference on the problems of the Near East, as advocated by the Soviet Union.

For the moment the situation in the Gulf remains critical. Judging by everything, Baghdad is counting on getting its own way by pursuing a policy of "faits accomplis." It is likely that it may settle Iraqis in Kuwait. It may pick holes in the international blockade, as has happened with Libya and Jordan. There are also other ways of exerting pressure—such as with hostages and terrorists. Although, admittedly, these are highly dubious methods. But, on the whole, the path of swallowing Kuwait leads to a dead end. In the opinion of the TEHRAN TIMES newspaper, "Iraq has bitten off more than it can ever chew." This Arab-Arab conflict could last many years and lead to a new correlation of forces in the region, pushing into the background—if not entirely overshadowing—the Palestinian problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The calls for a "jihad"—a "holy war"—against the United States are also quite risky for Iraq itself. First, because the Americans are acting in concert with Muslims who are equally fervent believers. Second, because of the unpredictable consequences of stoking Islamic religious fanaticism within Iraqi society.

Shiite Muslims make up the majority of the population in both Iran and Iraq. But power in Iraq is in the hands of a Sunni leadership. Throughout the war years Tehran painstakingly tried to rouse the Iraqi Shiite masses and encourage them to stage an Iranian-style Islamic revolution to overthrow the regime. Talk of a "jihad" opens up new opportunities for the messianic role which the successors of Imam Khamene'i have assumed.

That is why the unexpected reconciliation between Iran and Iraq was not as unexpected as Iran's statement of support for a "holy war" against U.S. imperialism. This support will allow Tehran to neutralize the sizable and well-armed Iranian opposition based in Iraq.

And, finally, the involvement of Iraq and Saudi Arabia in a major fight would paralyze these two main regional rivals of Tehran. Whatever the outcome, they would be weakened, and Iran would be confirmed as the region's only superpower.

You get the impression that Iraq has become a hostage to events. Just as was the case during the protracted Iran-Iraq war, which ended "honors even"—not counting the hundreds of thousands killed and the billions lost by the economies.

Is there a way out of this new crisis? Yes there is, and, clearly, the only sensible alternative to war is the fulfillment of the UN Security Council resolutions and the ending of the occupation of Kuwait.

Can the military machine do a U-turn? Is Baghdad capable of such a resolute change? Yes, it is. The recent reconciliation with Iran is an example of that. And let us hope that the temporarily triumphant logic of the absurd will give way to the logic of common sense.

Claims of Nuclear Submarine for India Refuted

PM1709105090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

["Knowledgeable Reader's Letter" by Captain Second Rank B. Metelev, officer of the Navy Main Staff: "Where the 'Wheel' Rolled To"]

[Text] I follow with great interest articles on Soviet-Indian cooperation, including in the military sphere. Unfortunately, they sometimes prompt puzzled questions in me, a specialist. It vexes me that a reader far removed from these problems might take some unverified information at face value. Take, for example, a relatively recent article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI.

"If the SUNDAY OBSERVER is to be believed, India intends to acquire a second nuclear submarine from the Soviet Union." These words began a dispatch carried under the intriguing title "Where the 'Wheel' Will Roll To." The author of the article recalled that the first Soviet nuclear-powered submarine was leased to India and joined the country's navy in 1988. It received the name Chakra, which means "spinning wheel," symbolizing the eternity of life (a chakra is depicted at the center of the Indian national flag).

So the foreign newspaper report served as grounds for arguments about the danger of a buildup of the arms race in the Indian Ocean zone. They were accompanied by an appeal for restraint and circumspection in the arms trade, as well as a recommendation to the USSR Supreme Soviet to prohibit very strictly the transfer of nuclear technologies. It would seem possible to agree unconditionally with the author's position. But I think that any experienced reader will have noticed that there has been a substitution of concepts in the article about the "wheel." The thing is that the leasing of a nuclear submarine is far from being the same thing as the transfer of nuclear technology. For, by following the foreign newspaper in making more than transparent allusions to some kind of mythical involvement of the USSR in making India a member of the "nuclear club," MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is, in fact, not only misleading its readers but also casting aspersions on the nature of our cooperation with a friendly state. For there has been and is no transfer of Soviet nuclear technology to India or, incidentally, to other states, and none is proposed. The official Soviet position on this is well known. And our words are not at variance with our deeds. To speak specifically of the leasing of the submarine Chakra, on board which, by the way, I have been repeatedly, I will remind you that it is earmarked only for training purposes. Its use for fulfilling combat tasks is ruled out. The submarine's nuclear power plant is under the control of Soviet specialists. Incidentally, the lease expires in a matter of months, and it is not planned to renew it.

As for the rumors of a second ship, these really are mere rumors. There is and has been no question of either leasing or, still less, selling such a combat ship. India has not put requests to the USSR in this regard.

In connection with the fact that MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI was followed by another publication in addressing the Chakra affair and it cannot be ruled out that some newspaper or magazine will also mention it, I would like to advise: Before ringing the alarm bells, it would not be a bad thing to consult the church calendar more carefully than THE SUNDAY OBSERVER did. Otherwise the wheel of fantasy could roll into an impassable maze.

East Europe

CSFR Deputy Premier Arrives for Trade Talks

LD1709194990 Prague CTK in English 1815 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow Sept 17 (CTK)—Czechoslovak Deputy Premier Vaclav Vales met today with Soviet Deputy Premier and Chairman of the State Commission for External Economic Affairs Stepan Sitaryan to discuss changes leading to a new economic business relationship.

Vaclav Vales also met with Russian Premier Ivan Silayev and Deputy Premier Gennadiy Filshinov.

Ivan Silayev praised highly Czechoslovakia's interest to keep up relations with the Russian Federation, developing future cooperation between the Russian Federation and Czechoslovakia was also discussed.

In talks with Gennadiy Filsinov the main topic of discussions was the supply of crude oil to Czechoslovakia.

Another meeting on ministerial level was arranged for the beginning of October.

Lithuanian Prime Minister Visits CSFR

Seeks To Establish Ties

LD1409224590 Prague Television Service in Slovak 2057 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Remarks by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene in Prague on 14 September—recorded in Russian with superimposed report in Slovak]

[Text] We not only want to declare our independence but realize it in practice, Mrs. Prunskiene said. Nonetheless we are still encountering big obstacles which proceed from the fact that the Soviet Union is still taking us as its territory. After Russia has declared her sovereignty, although one has to say that it is qualitatively different one from the Lithuanian one, this issue can be resolved easier if Russia herself will strive to establish official diplomatic relations with other ocuntries. Russia will probably have far less obstacles on the part of the center especially since President Gorbachev has identical views with the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and both are very close.

We however still do not know yet how the Soviet Union is going to behave if Lithuania wants to proceed in a similar manner like Russia. At present we feel an enormous pressure on the part of Russia to become the new center of the Soviet Union and integrate us into a new, or as it is said, a simulated Soviet Union.

At present we are not as yet completely clear in regard to our relations to the Soviet Union's government. Our relations with the Russian Federation have begun to be galvanized in several economic fields. We have not as yet however signed any political treaties.

Concerning our next question whether some diplomatic missions will be set up abroad, Mrs. Prunskiene replied that: yes, that it is very important since it means a confirmation of the independence of Lithuania. When we go back to the past we find that Lithuania already had a Lithuanian Embassy in Prague before World War II. These are not mere recollections but also a hope that they will be restored. Lithuania is already interested in setting up an interests office whether in Czechoslovakia or in other countries. Lithuania is working very intensively in Poland, the Scandinavian countries and elsewhere. But the prime concern will be the resolution of mutual relations with the Soviet Union, said Mrs. Kazimiera Prunskiene in conclusion.

Joint Trade Agreement Signed

LD1609220690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1920 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Summary] Kazimiera Prunskiene, the prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, returned from Czechoslovakia yesterday. The main objective reached during her visit to Czechoslovakia was the signing of a joint memorandum on the main principles of economic and trade relations between the two states.

It is stressed by both sides in the document that changes are necessary in the economic and trade relations mechanism in accordance with a gradual transition of the economies of the two states over to a market economy.

Taking the generally accepted practice in international trade relations into consideration, convertable currency will be used in settling trade accounts at the level of world prices. Other possibilities for settling accounts will also be used.

A draft intergovernmental agreement on economic and scientific cooperation for the period of 1991-92 is being worked out by relevant departments and ministries of Czechoslovakia and Lithuania. A draft agreement on trade relations will also be set up.

Hungarian President Sends Message to Gorbachev

LD1709181890 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—Hungarian President Arpad Goncz has sent a message to President Gorbachev, thanking for the greetings received, it was announced here today.

"Being president of Hungary, I am glad to have an opportunity to take part in the construction and strengthening of new relations with the peoples of the Soviet Union, which has embarked on the path of perestroyka" the telegram reads.

West Europe

Gorbachev Sends Message to British Conference

LD1609221790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 16 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Sidorov]

[Excerpts] Egham (Britain) 16 Sep (TASS)—The 40th Pugwash Conference opened today in the British town of Egham. [passage omitted]

A message of greetings from USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev was read out at the conference. It stressed, in particular: "I see the future century as one free from armed conflicts, from violence against people and nature, as an ecologically and morally clean world without mass hunger and without poverty and organized crime. The Pugwash movement—the generator of new, unconventional ideas—has done much to bring this future closer." [passage omitted]

Latvian, Danish Shipping Lines Form Joint Company

LD1709200790 Moscow TASS in English 1914 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent David Gefter]

[Text] Riga September 17 TASS—The Latvian Sea Shipping Line and the Danish Christian Jensen firm on Monday signed an agreement to set up a joint shipping company, Latsen.

The company aims to develop cargo traffic between Latvian and Danish ports. The Latvian shipping line has transferred the Irbitles motor ship to the company. The Danish side will modernise the ship. Later, the motor ship, whose crew will be made up of Riga sailors, will begin shipping cargoes for Latvia and foreign freighters.

Azerbaijani Premier's Visit to Turkey Noted

WA1709195390

For reportage on Azerbaijani Prime Minister Hasan Hasanov's visit to Turkey, including reports on his talks with Prime Minister Yildirim Akbulut, please see the Turkey section of the 17 September West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Latin America & Caribbean

State of Chernobyl Victims in Cuba Reported

PM1309125590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Sep 90 p 3

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Novikov; date not given: "For Foreign Pineapples. Our Children Are Being Sent for Treatment to the Other End of the World to Cuba. But Is It Worth It?"]

[Text] Havana—People working abroad always follow very attentively what the newspapers—especially the Soviet newspapers—write about their country of residence. As for Cuba, here every newspaper line devoted to "local topics" is virtually inspected with a magnifying glass. That is why there is nothing surprising in the fact that a recent item in our newspaper has really caused a rumpus both among Cubans and among Soviets. I have in mind the letter from one Ladyzhenko describing the "ordeals" of Soviet children who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident and have been sent to Cuba for treatment. There would seem to be no overt lying and as you read you want to drown yourself at the least: Half-starving children wander, downcast, through dirty army barracks—and so on in the same spirit. I can imagine the feelings now of the mothers who sent their children to this Golgotha! But I want to reassure them: It is not all that terrible.

I spent several hours in a camp housing over 1,000 Soviet children from three republics—Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia. What is it like? An enormous territory (20,000 children could be housed here at the same time) on which small, clean and comfortable cottages have been scattered. Yes, they are quite cramped—six to eight children live in each room, sleeping in bunks. And of course it is hot—Cuba is Cuba. Although I was told that if they wanted the children could move because there are more than enough empty cottages here. But there is no such desire because each child wants to live with "his own people."

One more discomfort is the water, which only runs from the tap for two to three hours a day. Here this is a nationwide problem and adds greatly to everyone's inconvenience.

Those who live here are also plagued by the "regime" under which they have to exist. From the best of motives but obviously with an excess of zeal, the Cubans have established such close supervision of the camp's inmates that not a single living soul can either enter or leave without the directors' permission. Police vehicles and numerous "controllers" in civilian clothing tour the territory. They say this is because Fidel has allegedly warned that if anything happens to even one Soviet person it means prison. But these are rumors.

But these inconveniences are more than compensated for by other things: the many hours of bathing in the sea, ice cream almost every day, several varieties of tasty Cuban kefir from strawberry to pineapple. The children have been simply inundated with fruit to the point where, I am shamed to say, half is thrown away into the garbage cans and the children fling pineapples and bananas around and play football with oranges. And this in a situation where in Cuba, a tropical country, fruit is a great rarity. If bananas are suddenly "thrown out" anywhere in Havana an enormous line immediately forms near them.

These observations can be summed up in literally one phrase: Cuban children have never had and do not have what their Soviet contemporaries are now enjoying. As for those who had counted on finding themselves in the Bahamas, I can only sympathize. It is a long time since Cuba was an earthly paradise and the Cubans have long since grown accustomed to poverty—just as we Soviets have, incidentally. What can you do? With the Soviet Union's active assistance in 30 years the same bitter fruit of "real socialism" with which we are so familiar have ripened here too.

Nonetheless it seems to me that we must know how to remain people and when someone does you a kindness you should not make a sour face but say "thank you." Of course, a counterargument can be found to any argument: "But what way out is there for the Cubans! If Fidel has issued an order they do everything they can." It is true that there is no way out for them. But after all it is not Fidel's property they are giving away—he will not be any worse off—but their own property, their last morsel. And, incidentally, they are giving it wholeheartedly, without begrudging that last morsel. Because the Cubans are a very good and kind people. They should not be confused... with anyone else.

That we should perhaps have managed without Cuba's aid is another matter. For instance, the Soviet children's fund has earmarked 1.5 million rubles [R] and $500,000 simply to transport the small "Chernobyl people." Let someone who can count money tell me what could have been done if all this money had been put toward reequipping and providing special facilities for, for instance, the "Orlenok" pioneer camp on the Black Sea. Then, you see, the children would not have had to be dragged to the other side of the world and the Cubans would not have been so disadvantaged.

So is everything so unclouded in this story? Alas, no. The problems arising from Cuban poverty cannot even be compared with those which we have generated ourselves. As is well known, the first group of our children arrived in Havana in March this year. The second—over 1,000—arrived in July. The former were paid more and and the latter less and since a Soviet person's desire for social justice knows no boundaries endless squabbles and rows naturally began. I do not want to go into the details but by the end of August the situation was such that the "March" group had completely fallen out with the "July" people (I naturally mean the adults) while the Miarianao hospital had fallen out with the William Soler hospital, the Belorussians had fallen out with the Ukrainians, and the Ukrainians with each other, as a result of which the letter published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA appeared.

This was also greatly assisted by the fact that role of guardians had been taken by bureaucrats from the rayon and oblast public education departments, students, and mothers who had traveled with their own children and were little concerned for other people's, and by people who were overt "string-pullers" who had gotten "abroad" by using their influence. Should we be surprised that with this powerful corps of guardians dozens of children were simply left unsupervised.

One more fact. After two small "Chernobyl people" incurably sick with leukemia died in a Havana hospital, absurd rumors began to circulate in the Ukraine to the effect that the Cubans are "conducting experiments on our children," "taking them hostage," and so forth. As a result many mothers simply refused to let their children go there and a previously selected Ukrainian group disintegrated and had to be formed anew. But what a way this was done! Many children arrived without any medical documents at all.

But even that is not the most terrible thing. During the investigation it emerged that the overwhelming majority of those who had arrived had first of all to be rid of lice.... To this day Cuban doctors cannot rid the heads of Soviet boys and girls of these funny insects.

There is however one more "but" in this whole story and it concerns the biggest kind of politics there is. Having recently begun to count our money we suddenly discovered that some people are in our debt. For instance, Cuba owes us over R15 billion. According to Western figures the USSR's annual military and economic aid to Cuba is approximately 46 billion. But where is all this going? Why, 30 years after the revolution, 30 years during which Cuba has received about $45 billion from the USSR, are the Cubans still in a sorry state, with even matches and floor cloths rationed? Where, into what maw, are these billions disappearing and whom in that case are we helping?

These questions have begun to be asked increasingly frequently lately by Soviet journalists and deputies. Of course, this greatly worries the Cuban leadership, which can no longer imagine itself without Soviet economic injections. And now the first consignment of Chernobyl children and "Afghans" has appeared in Havana for treatment and recuperation. It is very symptomatic that they were brought here not long before the visit to Cuba by a Soviet government delegation which was to sign the next documents on Soviet-Cuban economic cooperation for this year. Is it worth mentioning that the delegation was first of all taken on a tour of the hospitals housing the "Chernobyl people" and the "Afghans." Is it worth mentioning too that the delegation signed everything it was asked to. And now at the 28th Party Congress press center the idea was already being voiced that we cannot cut back on aid to Cuba since we have certain moral obligations to it....

Politics are always a rather dishonest game. In this situation what jars on me personally is that charity is being played as a trump card here and that a kind of nasty shadow is thus being cast on it.

Nonetheless let us be grateful to the Cubans. To those who are tending and treating our children and feeding them pineapples unavailable to their own children.

Cuban Leader on Fuel Problem, Economy

LD1709080890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] At a meeting with young communists in Havana, Fidel Castro has touched on the fuel problem in Cuba. If the necessity arises of applying harsh economy measures, then the working day will be reduced, Castro said. Our policy is not to increase prices and not to promote mass disruptions. Everything at Cuba's disposal will be shared between everyone rationally and justly, he stressed. At the end of last month it was declared that the USSR, which has traditionally exported oil to Cuba, is in no position to ensure the volume of deliveries corresponding to accords. In connection with this, the government has taken measures to save fuel.

Cuban Paper's Attack on IVZESTIYA Item Countered

PM1809084990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Kamorin: "Discussion or Wrangling"]

[Text] Havana—Last Wednesday the Cuban Communists' central organ, GRANMA, devoted its entire back page to an article by journalist Felix Pita headlined "The Truth About Fuel Supplies" in which he attacked with typical emotionalism the commentary "What Is the Cause?" published in IZVESTIYA (No. 244).

I would remind you that this article discussed the emergency economy measures introduced on the island in connection with the acute shortage of liquid fuel, with which Cuba is traditionally supplied by the USSR. By way of an introduction GRANMA published the full text of the IZVESTIYA article, with which it took issue in harsh and, I would say, excited tones. But the surprising thing is that 40 percent of the material quoted was never published in IZVESTIYA, but was taken from a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA article on a similar topic. Moreover, in his commentary F. Pita predominantly criticized those "quotations" which had never appeared in IZVESTIYA's report.

You will agree that, regardless of the reasons for this awkward situation, it is at the least a question of a breach of the fundamental principles of professional ethics. I must say to the credit of my colleagues from GRANMA that they published a 20-line explanation in the next issue in which they apologized for the mistake, casting the blame for this on the translators. Admittedly, this explanation was not broadcast on radio and television, unlike Felix Pita's commentary. What is more, the explanation clearly says that this corruption does not alter the essence of the "worthy rebuke" dealt to the IZVESTIYA correspondent.

As for the crux of the dispute, it is primarily a matter of figures. In their appeal to the population regarding the economy measures the Cuban authorities attributed the need for these measures to a shortfall of roughly 2 million tonnes in deliveries of oil and petroleum products from the Soviet Union by the end of August. My commentary indisputably acknowledges that there was a shortfall, but estimates it at roughly 580,000 tonnes. But it is quite nonsensical discussing this question. The point is that this year's contractual commitments only stipulated the annual volume of shipments and did not provide a monthly or quarterly breakdown. Thus, the Cuban and Soviet sides are doing their sums on the basis of requirements and capacities respectively. There is, thus, no schedule enshrined in law for this year, both figures are justified, reflecting the viewpoints of the two commercial partners. They were both cited in IZVESTIYA's article. Why then break a lance?

I leave Felix Pita's overemotional vocabulary to his conscience. Any unbiased reader can see for himself that only an inordinate desire to "cause trouble" can account for GRANMA's imputing to IZVESTIYA's correspondent intentions of "poisoning relations between Cuba and the USSR," "casting Cuba in the role of swindler and cheat," or "misinforming readers."

It is a very great pity that GRANMA has taken this tone. Soviet-Cuban trade and economic relations are currently going through a difficult stage, due, in particular, to the transition to new trading conditions within the CEMA framework. There is something for journalists from both countries to think about here provided, of course, that there is balanced dialogue.

As for the friendship between our peoples which is, in F. Pita's opinion, being undermined by the aforementioned Soviet articles, it can hardly be strengthened by intimations that the USSR is the source of Cuba's economic ills.

Felix Pita begins his article with the following words: "In order to write objectively and reflect the situation one must first be aware of it." I fully agree with him.

RSFSR, Cuba Sign Health Cooperation Pact

LD1809053190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)—"The horizons of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Cuba are great". I am profoundly convinced that it will be successfully developed in various spheres of human activity, and not only with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] but also all the Soviet republics, said Jose Ramon Balaguer Cabrera, ambassador of the Republic of Cuba to the USSR, in a conversation with a TASS correspondent.

Along with Nikolay Karkishchenko, RSFSR deputy minister of health, he today placed his signature under a "protocol on cooperation between the RSFSR Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Cuba in the field of the health services and medical science for 1991-95". Present at the ceremony of the signing of the document in the premises of the Cuban Embassy were Boris Isakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet; and Ricardo Gonzalez, a representative of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Cuba in the USSR.

The protocol provides for the development of cooperation in the field of the protection of health of the mother and child, stomatology, medical equipment, the environment, pharmacology, the setting up of joint enterprises and the training of the family doctor and medical personnel.

The content of the document, the ambassador emphasized, points to the sides' mutual desire to work out new forms of cooperation which, together with ensuring mutual benefit, would promote the maintaining of the traditionally deep-rooted fraternal ties of friendship with all the Soviet republics.

Nikolay Karkishchenko noted that, in determining the directions of cooperation with Cuba, "we proceeded from the fact that the Cuban people have great achievements in the field of creating medical equipment and pharmacology".

New Ambassador to Argentina Appointed

LD1309230190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Sep (TASS)—The USSR president has appointed Vladimir Nikitin as the USSR's ambassador to the Argentine Republic.

The USSR president has relieved Oleg Kvasov of his duties as the USSR's ambassador to the Argentine Republic.

Vladimir Nikitin, born in 1940, is Russian. In 1968, he graduated from the USSR Foreign Ministry's State Institute of International Relations, Moscow. In 1977-81, Vladimir Nikitin was first secretary and counsellor at the USSR embassy in Peru; in 1981-86, he was a counsellor in the secretariat of the first deputy foreign minister. In 1986-88, he was deputy head of the Second Latin American department. Since 1989, he has been first deputy head of the Latin American Countries Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

He holds the diplomatic rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary.

Honduras To Establish Diplomatic Ties

LD1409064690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Honduran President Callejas has announced his government's intention to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in the near future. This event will take place in late September when he meets USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at the UN headquarters in New York.

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Discusses Market at 17 Sep Proceedings

Supports Shatalin Program

LD1709191190 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov, Andrey Orlov, and Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—The Soviet parliament today opened a heated debate about the Soviet Union's transition to a market economy.

Explaining his stand on various draft economic programmes, President Mikhail Gorbachev told parliament that he favoured Academician Stanislav Shatalin's programme.

Nevertheless, he said the document "could hardly be regarded as perfect and faultless." At the same time, Gorbachev rejected accusations that the Shatalin programme "leads to capitalism."

He said its merit is that it envisages transition through stabilisation and support of constituent republics.

Commenting on recent demands to "reshuffle top echelons," Gorbachev described them as "absolutely unacceptable."

He said such a reshuffle "would draw us into grim political battles and enhance confrontation in society at a time when we most badly need consolidation to carry out the market economy programme and draft a new federal treaty."

Then the session was addressed by Abel Aganbegyan, who headed a "conciliatory commission," set up to compare and sum up reform programmes.

He said the programme proposed by the government and the one prepared by Shatalin were "incompatible," and expressed support for the Shatalin programme.

He did not rule out, however, that the sides could reach agreement on some issues.

Shatalin and Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, the main architect of the government programme, spoke about their reform programmes.

In the afternoon, deputies discussed the draft programmes.

Concluding the afternoon sitting, parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov commented on a report about a hunger strike declared by parliament Deputies Zoriy Balayan, Viktor Ambartsumyan, Sos Sarkisyan and Vachagan Grigoryan.

The four demand the "restoration of Soviet power in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region [NKAO]."

Lukyanov said President Gorbachev and leaders of the Soviet Government and parliament met Armenian and Azerbaijani leaders on September 12.

"As a result of more than three hours of discussions, the sides reached progress in establishing contacts between these republics, including on issues related to the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh," he said, adding that the talks were "very difficult."

Lukyanov expressed his "regret" over the hunger strike, saying "We are concerned about their lives and health and, of course, are interested in the normalisation of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and the restoration of Soviet power there."

Lukyanov said the Presidium of the Soviet parliament had urged the four deputies to stop their strike and try "other methods" to achieve their goals.

The parliamentary session will continue on Tuesday.

Speech Carried on Moscow Radio

LD1709131390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1123 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Speech by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at the 17 September USSR Supreme Soviet morning session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! You will hear the report by Comrade Aganbegyan, the addresses of Comrades Shatalin and Abalkin, and already within the framework of the plenary sitting, will continue discussion of the draft program for the transition to the market. I deliberately am not speaking of the full designation of the question but for brevity of expression.

It may be said that during these days, both the USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the Union republics will adopt perhaps the most important decisions of the years of perestroyka.

Knowing the creative potential of the present USSR Supreme Soviet, I hope that the deputies will carry out very serious and responsible work with a sense of great responsibility to the people.

Anticipating the speeches of the rapporteurs and the discussions at the session, I would like very briefly to speak of some questions and to express my attitude to the draft program which I submitted to you last week.

The first thing I would like to say is that I think we have much confusion regarding a transition to a market economy and about market relations themselves. The idea is fairly widespread that a transition to a market economy is a rejection of state regulation of economic processes, as if everything is being handed over the power of spontaneity, and this applies above all to retail prices.

And in our country it is just such ideas that are linked with the fears and apprehensions circulating in our society regarding the market economy, to the effect that a transition to it will have a negative effect on the people's living conditions. All these matters should really be clarified at this stage; it is time. This should have been done before, but even more so now. People really must know what is actually being discussed. This is vital since we cannot bank on the success of the cause if a significant proportion of the country's populace harbors the idea that a transition to a market economy is someone's devilish venture that has nothing in common with the interests of the working people.

It should immediately be said that we, of course, do not consider a market economy to be a panacea. The question of a transition to it arose in the course of the transformations being implemented.

It has been dictated by life itself and the logic of the changes which have taken place. Indeed, we have long since realized that it is only by radical economic reform that we can extricate ourselves from the crisis situation in which the country and our economy find themselves. Some time ago we identified as the central task of reform the overcoming of all negative consequences associated with the universal dominance of state property and with its monopolistic position. That is how we approached the understanding of the need at that time to transform property relations and the attainment, through this, of new forms of economic life and a new position of the individual as producer in the economy and in society.

In other words, we must take the path of removing state control and setting up a mixed economy in which state and joint-stock enterprises, cooperatives, and enterprises operating on leasehold principles—but also, on a certain scale, private enterprises—will operate as subjects with equal rights. With the attainment of a plurality of forms of ownership, we associate the solving of the vital question of the socialist revolution: how to overcome the alienation of man from the means of production, from ownership; we thereby combine socialism with the private interests of people. Here we actually return to the slogan familiar to us all: "Factories to the workers, land to the peasants!"

In this way we want to give a powerful boost to initiative, to the initiative of people, to their labor, to business enterprise; to open wide the possibilities of utilizing the achievements of science and technology and achieve a new dynamics of the country's economic development. But economic freedom and independent business activity by production collectives and individuals presuppose that their mutual relations take a variety of forms. That is natural—they must all enter into many different relations with each other, using certain rules, certain mechanisms of exchange and distribution. All this can be ensured in a market framework.

So we need a transition to market relations, the creation of a modern, full-blooded market. So the market is emerging now, at this stage in which, within the framework of radical economic reform, we have embarked on the road of removing state control and have committed ourselves to reforming ownership relations and adopted new forms of life.

I appeal to the deputies to pay due attention to studying this aspect of the matter because on this issue, as I have already said, there is much confusion and needless fear.

One further consideration: Within the framework of radical economic reform we are making a huge turn in the development of our society; but in making this turn, one must constantly bear in mind in what society we are implementing these fundamental transformations, otherwise we may make serious errors in policy and practice. One must always remember, know, see, and always take account of the context in which we are operating. You and I, to put it mildly, operate in a large country, a multinational state; we operate in a very complex society overburdened with problems, complexes, stereotypes, affections, and so forth.

To put it briefly, we must have a very clear view of the realities we are dealing with—economic, political, ideological, psychological, and emotional; of what has been done by generations of Soviet people; and of the deformations and mistakes made in choosing paths of transformation after the October Revolution. Any other approach is simply adventuristic and has no prospects.

When drawing up our plans for the future, we must do that not only in the context of our own development—I want to stress that, not only in the context of our own development—but in the context of the whole of world civilization, taking account both of its achievements and of the global problems facing it. Nor should we give way to euphoria that, as Comrade Bocherov asserts, in the West, in developed countries, in Australia everything is simply wonderful. The main thing, comrades, is not to let the following happen: that while renouncing one model forcibly foisted upon society in its time, we once again embark upon the path of subjectivism, the mechanical use of... the use of theoretical plans and the mechanical transfer of another's experience onto our soil. We cannot drive people by force into new forms of economic life, into stock-holding enterprises, into cooperatives, into lease-hold or private property without taking account of the realities of society, of the objective course of economic processes, people's fundamental interests, and people's very mood, psychology, attitude. We—and I want to stress this—must have such a policy and such laws, the implementation of which would allow people to choose freely, to make a choice as far as the form of ownership and the methods of management are concerned, proceeding from our adherence to the socialist idea to freedom, democracy, and social justice.

In connection with this, I want to talk about the correlation of the transformations we are implementing and intend to implement further and about the socialist idea, the socialist choices.

First, let us cast an eye over things. Is the standard of living we have now really in accordance with the ideals of socialism? And the worker's alienation from the means of production and from participation in the administration of the economy—what is that? Features of socialism? And the degree of social protection, the motivation of labor efforts, the measures to make a person interested in the results of his own work—are we really reaching out to socialism in all this? That is the real touchstone.

Now the second thing. The market democratizes economic relations, and socialism is inconceivable without democracy. By reforming property relations, we shall create a realistic and healthy basis for genuine collectivism; not the nationalization of all and sundry, but the creation of free associations of producers, joint stock companies, production and consumer cooperatives, associations of leaseholders and entrepreneurs: That is the high road to a genuine socialization of production on the principles of free will and economic expediency. It is here that the roots of the true socialization of our economy lie.

Third, only a balanced market can ensure the implementation of the basic principle of socialism: distribution according to labor. Monetary wages lose their value when shelves are empty. People cannot find the wares they need and cannot convert their income into goods. The consequence of this is loss of interest in intensive, highly productive labor and the emergence of social groups living as parasites on shortages and on the absence of normal market relations.

Finally, the fourth thing: social protection. The transition to market relations makes it possible to enrich this concept qualitatively and give it a genuinely socialist content. One still encounters an over-simplified—I would even say dependency-oriented—interpretation of the principle of social protection. It is being voiced now in discussions, not only among people who, let us say, are not very well versed on economics, but also in quite respectable gatherings. It is frequently all reduced to the establishment of a system of egalitarian material guarantees: a minimum wage, allocations for those incapable of work, pensions, housing, free medical care, and so on. All these guarantees are, of course, essential; and they must be given to all citizens regardless of their labor contribution to the growth of social well-being. This is what we must certainly provide for every citizen in accordance with the Constitution. But society must provide every person with the guaranteed right to free labor, to high wages for good results, to initiative.

Effective labor must be encouraged comprehensively by the very system of economic relations which is taking shape; this is why we need the market. Having defended the rights of highly productive workers, front-rank enterprises, inventors, and enterprising economic planners, we will be able to constantly raise the ceiling of minimum social guarantees for invalids and orphans, old people, mothers with many children, and for all the needy too. Well, there is the living link, the dialectics of the question.

I think the society toward which we are proceeding, where the political and economic fredoms of man and of labor collectives are being brought to the forefront; where democracy, lawfulness, initiative, and responsibility will triumph; where the state policy will be directed towards realizing the fundamental interests of working people, toward man's spiritual development, the guarantee of social justice—that society will become the real embodiment of socialist ideas.

In connection with the fact that in discussions on the transition to the market, the question of private property is being debated with particular acuteness, we should clarify this question also, examining it without prejudice and bias and within the context of our realities. That must be done inasmuch as in the Supreme Soviet the draft program elaborated by the Academcian Shatalin's group has already been called a program leading to capitalism, although it is enough to look at a diagram in the first volume of this program—on page 63—of the likely dynamics of the processes of denationalization of industry in the next seven to 12 years and it becomes clear that such accusations are simply groundless; but they are already being uttered here in the Supreme Soviet as the saying goes before the eyes of the whole people. Most likely it is a question of a mixed economy of which I have spoken already; moreover of a mixed economy in which private ownership plays a vital role only in some spheres and a highly limited role in society as a whole.

There have been stormy discussions recently on the question of private ownership of land. That is a fundamental question. It seems to me that the people themselves must decide it and decide it by referendum. Comrades, it is much too great a question to decide in cabinets, in auditoriums, in conference halls—even in such responsible ones as you and I are working in today.

The question of whether there should be private ownership of land is a question of the sovereign right of the people, and it can be decided only by referendum. That is my point of view. I have expressed it already; I want to reiterate it now because we are discusing questions connected with the transition to the market.

In my view, it cannot be otherwise. I think the Supreme Soviet must deliberate this and take a stand on this.

Also it must be said openly and directly that what we are to do on the path of the transition to the market, to new forms of economic life is an extremely large-scale and complex matter; and there are no easy solutions to be foreseen here. Therefore we should not frighten people with the market and cultivate fears; but neither should we oversimplify it. I believe we cannot avoid extremes in our country, and there are extremes here too. Some people think it is all easy and that everything will work out with a wave of the hand. No, it will be the most profound turn-around we shall experience in the history of our fatherland. There is much to be considered and decided, and everything must be done in order to begin a transition to the market. But I believe that the majority of the people in the country already understand well what must be done. More than that, we simply cannot continue to put off the implementation of this task.

I would now like to express my attitude about the draft that has been prepared at the concluding stage by a collective of scientists and specialists led by Academician Aganbegyan. As I have said already, we were faced with a task, and this group was given instructions on the basis of this to attempt to integrate, to bring the positions closer, and to reach a single program. What can be said? I believe they did not succeed completely in coping with this task. Although the document I have sent to you is the result of joint efforts, nevertheless, as you can see the final variant has been signed by Comrades Aganbegyan and Shatalin; but Academician Abalkin has made a number of critical remarks which he even considered necessary to send you as an appendix to this report.

What is my attitude about the draft? I believe it is still a long way from being perfect and irreproachable. It also contains controversial clauses. Nevertheless, I believe this draft, this draft program might be a basis for discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in the republican supreme soviets. Proceeding from this assessment, I have considered it possible to support it and to send it to you for discussion.

I have no intention of stating the contents of the program; this is the task of the rapporteurs. I would only like to dwell on the general philosophy of the proposed approach, because I believe it to be a very significant distinguishing characteristic of this variant of the program.

The main thing in the variant being presented to the Supreme Soviet is an entry into the market through a period of stabilization, that is, through a period during which harsh measures should be adopted on monetary financial recovery and the restoration of disentegrating economic ties. Overall, I believe the authors proceeded from reality. Over the past months there has been a clear disentegration of the consumer market, an increase in the budget deficit and the state debt, a disorganization of money circulation, and an outburst of speculation and the shadow economy.

All this is proceeding concurrent with a fall in contractual discipline, a disruption of economic relations, and a total halt in several vitally important production areas, including the production of medicines. Various permutations of developments, even the most unfavorable, must be foreseen in the path of realizing the program of stabilization measures. A rapid-response scenario must be on hand. In a word, we will have to adopt drastic measures, beginning in the next few days—incidentally, perhaps on individual matters—without waiting for the approval of the program because the economic situation itself dictates the necessity of such measures. We must all understand that such measures are vitally important for us. We also have a right to expect support in society. If we cope with this task, then we can ensure a less painful entry into a market economy. On the other hand, without the realization of stabilization measures, there can be no question of any kind of market economy and we will find ourselves in the most onerous situation, in a state of chaos from which the way out will be long, painful, and difficult.

Further, I consider an important facet of this draft to be the fact that proposals of the Union republics are integrated in it. Their vision of a future all-Union market economy is reflected. This is extremely important since we are to implement this program in conditions of a multi-ethnic state, moreover at the stage of its profound transformation. The main aim, comrades—returning to this main plan and having expressed my thinking regarding the two most important facets—consists in making the ruble a sound, reliable means of payment via a system of stabilizing measures. This will make it possible to stop the flight from the ruble and to make saving money and its location in shares, securities, and bank accounts advantageous. When we manage to bridle the emission of money, stabilize the general mass of money, and partially reorient the money demand of the population, the state will then be able to gradually relax price control—and gradually is the word—on groups of goods which are not vitally necessary and only after energetic measures to stabilize money in circulation are executed.

I am drawing particular attention to this aspect because in the course of the discussion someone, either through confusion or because he did not read the program carefully, has forgotten the strictly designated succession of stages and sequence of measures being carried out.

The point here is precisely how events are ordered in time. It is not worth changing them around or starting to let prices go without having obtained the necessary effect from normalizing the money circulation, whereupon hyper-inflation would become a fact, and moreover inevitable, and it would be difficult to predict its scale. For this reason it is proposed that this process be rigorously controlled, literally step by step, day by day, with the utmost concentration and rapid response to any unexpected situation.

Returning to the second feature I mentioned, precisely the fact that a great deal has been taken into account in the program: what was said by the representatives of the republics. And they were at work constantly, taking part in preparing the ideas for this program. I must say that this process itself has served well enough for drafting the all-Union treaty. If centrifugal tendencies were manifested fairly clearly in the initial stage—to put it bluntly, isolationist sentiments and even separatism—the further work on the draft program of transition to the market advanced and the more profound it became, the more agreement emerged with regard to what not only the market should be like but our Union of sovereign states itself. In any case, work on the economic aspects of the future Union treaty has shown that in the interests of all peoples it is essential to arrive at a new level of mutual relations and cooperation, while at the same time understanding the exceptional importance of preserving the Union as a multinational state based on principles of free will, equality, and cooperation between sovereign states. In this way we have made fairly sound advances in our understanding of the fundamental issue: what the question of the fate of our multinational state represents for us and for the whole of our society.

Next, the draft program contains proposals about approaches to further improving the system of authority and government, as applied to the conditions in which a market economy functions. This also merits the attention of the USSR Supreme Soviet, even more so when various points of view are evident on these matters.

In any case, there are many who propose even now, without delay, the execution of cardinal restructuring and perhaps even a shakeup of the whole system of authority and administration at all levels, primarily at the top echelon.

In recent days, as recently as yesterday, "Down with the government!," "Dissolve the Supreme Soviet!," "Dissolve the Congress of People's Deputies!," "Down with the president!," and so forth have been heard. I have already spoken to you on this subject; but I believe it is important to say it in this connection as well, when you will be studying this aspect of what the system of authority and administration should be, taking into account a transition to a market economy. I really think the formulation of the question we are hearing from various podiums, and especially from squares, is completely unacceptable. If we pursued this restructuring, this shake-up, it would draw us into hard political battles and would strengthen confrontation in society.

And this at a time when we need as never before to consolidate to realize the program for transition to the market and draw up and implement a new Union treaty. If there is one thing we must tackle now, it is the solution of these problems. At the same time—and I am repeating myself here, but must say it nevertheless—we cannot manage without making changes and adjustments where necessary to the organizing and functioning of power and government. This will be organically connected based on the needs of the market economy of a multi-ethnic state, not self-oppressing in character. I think we must all take account of the full complexity of the present situation in society. It is such that it contains within itself both vast potential possibilities and also very great dangers, however. So we must act now in such a way as to use all opportunities of altering the situation radically for the better and not allow the negative processes to develop further.

In general we need an active policy, active work. Speaking concretely in a manner applicable to the present stage, I see that the policy must be directed toward implementing urgent measures to stabilize the whole situation in society. Here I have in mind economic, political, and legal stabilization. Insofar as we have actually reached the phase of fundamental changes which will lead to a radical renewal of our society, all strata of the people, all political tendencies must subordinate their activities to this.

We must resolutely oppose that which now incites people to use acute forms, strikes, demonstrations, and so on. Who does—where, in what state, in approaching what—when necessary—we have in earnest reached the point—[at a time when we] stand on the threshold of great and profound changes from which we indeed expect an improvement of the situation in the country, [it is inexcusable] to be drawn into these political battles now, and shoot at each other with guns of any caliber, and take no account as it were of what charges we are letting loose on each other. [sentence as heard] There are already signs of this. I think all sections of the people, all political tendencies, must now subordinate themselves—I repeat this thought—to the main thing: the interests of the people and the solving of tasks from which the people must receive at last some positive yield. He who now holds up or impedes the realization of this objective by ill-considered steps will take upon himself a grave responsibility before the people and before history.

Academicians Debate Economic Reform Proposals

Aganbegyan Backs Shatalin Plan

LD1709214390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Speech by Academician Abel Aganbegyan at the USSR Supreme Soviet on 17 September in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] The first question is about economic relations in a union of sovereign republics. Since the time when the government concept for the transition to the market was examined here in the Supreme Soviet in May and June this year, radical changes have taken place which change in principle the very approach toward the working out and especially toward the implementation of this concept. Elections have taken place to the supreme bodies of power in the Union republics. Declarations of sovereignty have been adopted, and in fact they have been adopted virtually unanimously and have been approved by the peoples of the republics. The new bodies of power in the republics now enjoy the highest trust of their peoples. And overall these are great and positive changes, positive trends of perestroyka: This is a colossal potential that we must not simply hold dear, but we must place these new realities at the foundation of a most difficult period of stabilization and transition to the market. Indeed, they must assist us to a decisive extent in implementing this difficult process.

And so, the Gorbachev-Yeltsin working group has in my view done what was almost impossible in these new conditions and I pay tribute to these comrades. It has achieved a consensus of the positions of the president of the USSR and the leadership of 14 republics. Estonia did not participate in this work: It did not send its representatives to work in the working group. And fundamental accords were achieved on key issues of the economic relations of the Union and the sovereign republics. The distribution of economic functions between the Union and the republics was set down. Taxation, budgetary, and currency questions were decided. The direction of measures to stabilize the transition to the market was agreed. Agreement was reached on the fundamental role of the Union republics themselves in this process. All of this is expressed in the first section dealing with the concept: The first conceptual section was indeed the subject of joint work by the empowered representatives of these republics and the working group of Academician Shatalin. At the first conference of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation under the leadership of the president of the USSR at the end of August leaders of the republics who are present here spoke overall with approval of this working draft and especially of that part of it where questions concerning the economic interaction of the republics were reflected. And in my view this is a colossal achievement which is of decisive importance for emerging from the crisis and which provides hope of success for what would have seemed to have been a hopeless cause before that.

One has to realize fully, comrades, that the economic position of the country now is catastrophic. Following the sharp crises that arose in 1988 in the consumer market, the monetary system, and the finances of the country, as well as the lowering of the living standards of the population, to these was added in 1989 the crisis of the country's inability to pay, and all of this developed to an enormous extent in the months that have gone by of both 1989 and 1990, and now—in 1990 already—the direct collapse of economic ties has begun, a sharp decline in the value of money, a shift toward trading in kind, and a spontaneous, uncontrolled fall at an ever accelerating rate in public-sector production. For different reasons more than 400 enterprises in the country have now been brought to a halt and several thousand more are on the brink of stopping. The real situation must be assessed not by statistics showing how much we are producing today, how far production has declined over seven or eight months. One has to look at the trends and make forecasts; one has to look at the day to come.

Well, if we did so, and this has been done by a working group, we came to the conclusion that the situation is far worse than can now be seen on the surface. The thought being constantly repeated—that it is not going to be worse, that it cannot be worse—is not true. Everything happening now is nothing compared to what can happen. It should be admitted that it can be immeasurably worse. We are close to the limit beyond which disintegration of our economy, chaos, disorder, and social shocks start. The situation is extremely difficult and most dangerous. It will be possible to get out of this situation only by consolidating all healthy forces of society, all progressive public movements, and mainly by the concerted action of the center and all republics, given the trust of the people. Just think, after all, because of the hold-up in credits provided by Western banks we are threatened by a 20-percent reduction in the volume of production next year. Just because of this factor we can be put back five to seven years as far as the levels of output are concerned, with general disorganization of the whole economy. Credits are not being granted because there is no unity in the country, it is not known to whom to give them.

The partition of power is taking place. Uncertainty. There is no single program for a way out of the dead end. There is no consolidation. After all, banks do not deal with their own money; this money belongs to clients. Of course, they cannot invest this money unless they have firm, clear-cut guarantees. The more so as other, more complicated issues of our internal life are concerned. As has been shown by the results of the work of the working group of Stanislav Sergeyevich Shatalin and as has been understood by all the republics and workers who have been invited to work in this working group and by representatives of various other strata of our society, the disintegration of economic ties, chaos, and social shocks are bad for everybody. Nobody will be left unaffected. That is why everybody has a strong, common interest to get out of the crisis, to stabilize the situation, to introduce order in the country, to go over to the market, and on this basis to make our economy healthier and to breathe new life in it. But common interest and common objective being everybody's desire is one thing, and the transfer of this common interest to the language of a common program that will unite people is another thing. It seems to me that in the work of the working group, in what they prepared in an incredibly short period of time—in less than a month—there are foundations for such a program.

It is not perfect. Stanislav Sergeyevich himself does not give it very high marks. If people were given an opportunity to work for several months it would have been possible to put it all better, but there is a basis and that is the main thing. This basis first of all touches upon the main issue which is the cooperation between the Union and the sovereign republics. First of all, let me clarify some misunderstandings that have taken place here; that given the approach being expressed in the report there is no Union, there are only republics. The Union has absolutely no rights whatsoever, and so on. If you open to page 15 of the draft conciliation program—I should use the conventional term conciliation—or page 20 of the report by Shatalin's working groups, it is written quite clearly that the Union as well as the Union republics are the subject of economy and economic regulation. If I translated this into common, understandable language, this phrase is significant in the sense that the Union is preserving its great role in the economy.

The conciliation program, as in Shatalin's draft, speaks of all-Union property. That is natural, but since the republics delegate their powers to the Union—and this is clearly expressed in the government report, and commonsense would suggest that, indeed if it is a Union what is it formed for—so naturally this is all-Union property and it is delegated by the republics. So it can be regarded as the joint property of the whole people, that is, of all the republics. I do not see anything damaging to the Union here. It would be funny to have any property in the Union not of the people. Who are the people? They are the people of all the republics.

Shatalin on Property, Currency

LD1809012190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Speech by Academician Stanislav Shatalin at USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 17 September—recorded]

[Text] Together with my comrades, I have carried out one task: To show how to switch to a market economy, but I did not set myself the task of describing how a market economy would function. The second task is 1,000 times more difficult than the first task. We proceed from the realistic acknowledgement of the fact that we have sovereign republic states. We are not playing politics with this thesis, though we did not tackle the political side of the Union treaty at all, since we did not have such an instruction. Although, of course, here we have always felt and realized—you understand without this I would simply be too naive a person—that the implementation of our program must, without fail, radically shake up both the economy and our political system, though it seems to me that here, in this field, we have moved far further in the right direction than in the field of the economy.

For this reason, to leap over the republics now and to conduct everything from the center is a task like trying to square the circle: It simply no longer has a solution. Thus, once again let me speak about the republics with regard to an economic union.

Comrades, Abel Gezevich [Aganbegyan] has said, and I will confirm: What was thrown out of the third part of our program when the compromise program was being discussed?

First, the supremacy of the laws of the republics, and honestly, I have to say straightaway that the republics do not know about this. It has been done with our hands, by the center. Therefore, this is a question that should be discussed further, and I do not have the right to hide this from you. And the next accord: On the introduction of a federal, in brackets, of a Union treaty, the (?articles) of which are determined in accordance with agreement between republics. This is what is now written in the compromise document. In our document it was written thus: That the republics have only a two-level system of incomes: The local, that is, municipal or local; and the republican, and pay the Union, contribute to the Union budget a certain part of the incomes received within the republic, either depending on the volume of the gross national product, calculated according to the Western pattern, or on the volumn of the per capita gross national product. That was what was written; now the wording is as follows, as I will tell you, as Abel Gezevich has said: A federal tax from enterprises at rates agreed with the republics.

As an economic mathematician I can prove that in certain cases this option is no different. In other cases, this option has a similarity coefficient of 0.8:1, and so on. For this reason, I agreed to this kind of compromise. On the whole, I am by nature, so they say, a more aggressive person, but I am a person inclined toward compromise, and so on. Just as Abel Gezevich, I see no encroachment whatsoever upon the rights of the center in the wording that Union property is the collective and joint property of all the republics. I believe this to be correct, this reflects reality, and in no way encroaches upon the center, if we simply understand this precisely and correctly.

Never mind, we feared and lived with property common to the people, which belonged to everyone and to no one. Now, suddenly, people have started being afraid of property common to the people, or Union property being the collective property of the republics. Somehow we seem very quickly to be changing even our political attitudes; perhaps these attitudes are often old, but not sufficiently stupid.

The next issue, from which we proceeded. This is an issue, this is really the pivot of the program—it exists in the government program too—I have to acknowledge this also: This is the problem of the convertible ruble. This is an extremely tough problem of finance, currency, and fiscal policy. An extremely tough problem, with all the resulting consequences. Abel Gezevich has already spoken about stabilization measures, and I do not wish to repeat them: They all coincide with our report. There are, indeed, certain additional measures in the package, which the country's president has. I do not know how he intends to make them public. That is a matter for the country's president, but we have added such a reinforced measure for stabilization.

Until there is a ruble, until the ruble gets a bit stronger, the economy will be weak just as before. If the ruble starts to get stronger, we shall consider that the program to stabilize the economy, and the program to prepare it for the market, the program of moving toward the market has really proved fruitful.

Many of our opponents tell us: You are adventurists. You will not do that in 18 months. Naturally, if you do not believe in anything, you will not do anything—in a year or in 18 months—or as we have seen for ourselves, in five years in the sphere of the economy. And in 70 years one may not do anything. If one continues, everything can go on for a long, long time.

But if we want to clamber out, if we want to save our country and the really great people that live in it, we have to believe in this system. It is correct from a professional point of view. It has really been looked at by people who understand the market economy better than we do. It is correct.

The question is just a small one: Who will implement it and how? That is a question that will be decided by the legislators of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the republican supreme soviets.

That question is an extremely difficult one. It is one and half times more complicated than what we have dealt with until now. But one has to understand that precisely. If we continue saying just as before that we are not for this, we are not prepared for that, we are not ready for the market, the population will not understand us, the people will not believe us and so forth. You understand that we have to put a stop to this talk. We must act together, toughly, strengthening the authority of power.

The next question—on land reform. This has already been discussed. I shall just say a couple of words. We are not destroying anyone. They ascribe to us that we want to break up the collective farms, state farms, to divide everything up, to wipe away everything that was here until we came. This is absolute nonsense. On not a single page of our program will you see that we say that this is bad, that it must be removed, when it comes to collective farms. No, we say that, depending on specific conditions, the question of land, including private property, can be resolved.

Now I shall explain, Mikhail Sergeyevich, since I cannot fail to bow to this. We bow to [word indistinct] really sincerely. We believe that any form should have the right to exist. And we should find those niches, I reiterate, where different forms—collective and state farms, farmsteads and so forth—turn out to be the most efficient. It is a difficult question, a very difficult one. But we are proceeding from this.

Now let us go on. I would like to really speak about the new approach. We have had enough of the philosophy of upstarts, of the philosophy of plundering and sharing. We have had enough of social autocracy. We have had enough social parasitism and irresponsibility. Enough. Above all, if we are talking about the sovereignty of the individual, this gives us the opportunity to create such a social, economic, and political system that would allow us to say: I am completely open. And so that I can say in the end when I leave this life, that I was given all the conditions to realize myself as an individual. If this was not done, then I myself am to blame. And we want to make it that I am the most important and that one individual does not ascert his rights at the expense of another. This is our program. [applause]

We really want the main social manifestation to be the possibility for a person to feel like that and to afford him the opportunity to earn money, to occupy himself with one activity or another where he will bring the maximum benefit. We do not have any other ideology. I think that we have dispelled the concept of social protection, although without a doubt much can still [words indistinct]. Now [words indistinct] the government's program, that document that you have read in IZVESTIYA, I think that that is a step forward, a very big [word indistinct] that we could not mutually [word indistinct] many of these documents on the social protection of the population.

The next question: On housing reform—I will not speak about this now. This has been noted down, this is a very difficult question, but you realize that we cannot build a market economy without problems of housing reform. Also, without this, there will not be a labor market, nor a shift, but you all know this very well. While we are living a system of slavery of residence permits, and so on, and so forth, there cannot be a market. Yes, all these illusions must be cast aside. Therefore, a housing market, but taking into account, as we have seen—which would guarantee the less well-off, pensioners, and so on, social assistance, even free distribution of housing, property, which you have seen from our documents—it seems to me we cannot get by without such housing reform.

If we have a market economy, will we not be killing the health service, culture, education, fundamental sciences? That is a correct, sensible, and a good fear to have. This question is a most important one. With all our enthusiasm for markets, we must not be like those people who dash around all over the place crying: Who is in favor of a market, who is against a market? We are proceeding absolutely only one way—toward a market. We are doing this simultaneously—[words indistinct]—the protection of people who are working in these spheres, and we cannot lose those gains: True, if we are honest, not very big ones, but we do not have the right to lose those social guarantees like the health services, culture, education, and science, which we now have. If there is anarchy, we can do nothing. Nothing. It will make no difference whether this program, the government program or the president's, remains. All this will be a scrap of paper, and then our grandsons and granddaughters will read that at one time their grandfathers spoke somewhere, they were someone—all this will be coarse material. Whether they are sensible, intelligent, foolish, it will not matter if we do not take the most radical measures to stabilize not only the economy, but also authority and order in the country.

Abalkin on Switch to Market

LD1709224490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Speech by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 17 September—recorded]

[Text] First of all, the proposal to start with economic recovery is not an invention of the working group, it is the starting point of the government program approved last December by the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. Since December last year we have been working consistently to perfect one program. This program was approved by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. The resolution of the congress, adopted in December, states that the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR supports the measures proposed in the USSR Government's program. We have further improved them and this is not a third new program; it is a program of practical activity amplified to take into account the real change in public life. In this same resolution of the congress, Point 1 says it is necessary to pay careful attention to and take into consideration the remarks made by the people's deputies, and goes on: Basic measures should be implemented for financial recovery, the stabilization of money circulation, and the replenishment the internal consumer market in the course of the years 1990-92. This is a realistic assessment, based on the fact that this cannot be done in 100 days.

The second amplification concerns taking into account the new conditions of development in our country relating to the sovereignty of the republics, the declarations of independence, and other documents. Here I have already stressed that in this part about the delegation of powers to the center both programs are textually very close and enumerate the functions voluntarily delegated to the congresses. On this I should stress that this too is not a result of research by the working group, nor is it the result of specific proposals by the government. It is a rephrasing, based on the law already adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the demarcation of functions between subjects of the federation, in which everything has already been written and decided. The things that had already been elaborated and by which we must be guided if we respect the laws have simply been transferred into literary form.

I particularly want to stress that, as specified by the law you adopted, we are consistent in considering not only the Union republics but the autonomous republics, too, as subjects of the federation; we take carefully into consideration the complex and difficult question of equalizing the starting conditions of the Union republics and the autonomous republics during the transition to the market, and in fulfillment of this we envision the establishment of a special equalization fund in pursuance of the objective in question.

For the last clarification, I would like to say that when we talk about the transition to the market—and before the break we spent two hours talking about this—we must not forget, and for some reason or other I do not think I heard this mentioned in the last two speeches—we must not forget that the subjects of this market are socialist producers of goods—enterprises, associations, cooperatives, lease-contracting collectives, individual and family enterprises, farmers collectives, and so on—these are the subjects of the market, the enterprises and their labor collectives. On the all-Union market no departmental or regional barriers hampering freedom and the freedom of the entrepreneurial activity, the exchange of goods and services, and their orientation toward the solution of the tasks of the national economy and the satisfaction of public requirements are permissible.

I would like to stress especially that in discussing the program of entry into the market and the transition we cannot get away from the realities and forget the living and real functioning of the economy. The economy is a living organism that, like the circulation of the blood in the human organism, like its rhythmic pulse, cannot stop for a single minute, and we must make our actions commensurate with these realities.

We are very greatly concerned over the state of our economy in the fourth quarter and particularly in 1991. We are now compelled—and this can be taken in different ways, it can be received with understanding, it can be met with disapproval—we are now obliged to ensure against the inability of the local bodies to solve the tasks that wholly belong to their functions and powers, their inability to solve the food problems, preparedness for the winter, the bringing in of the harvest, things that, I repeat, are entirely part of the responsibilities of the republics and the local soviets. But there are direct appeals and requests for us to interfere and provide support and we have been obliged to do so, diverting effort from the solution of those strategic tasks that are the function of the government.

Much urgent work is now being carried out in order to maintain the country's production rhythm at the appropriate level until the end of this year and to prepare for next year. We cannot escape the instructions that have been given, and within the next 10 days—no later than that—the government will put forward for examination by yourselves—to be more precise it will not be the government but our central economic bodies, the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR Ministry of Finance—and within the next 10 days it will put forward for your examination a draft plan and a draft budget for 1991, how we are going to be living. We are working out these proposals and we will put them forward, relying upon laws of the USSR that have been adopted and that are in operation, upon the instructions that have been given to us, and upon the concept developed in the government program. No other has been adopted or approved, but we cannot ask the Supreme Soviet to excuse us, we're going to wait until you work out a program, and we will only put forward our proposals afterward.

So it is especially important that this is not just debate in parliament but constitutes material by which tens of thousands of industrial, agricultural enterprises, building, transport enterprises, and those of all the other spheres of the national economy are to live. We once again insistently ask the supreme soviets of the Union republics not to delay the examination of these quesitons that come under their economic jurisdiction and concern local budgets, otherwise we may halt very important processes in the country and then we shall be wanting to know who is to blame.

Taking into account the importance not only of the financial and monetary recovery of the economy but also the maintenance of steady relations in the national economy, the government has asked the president to issue a special decree by his authority and power which would make it possible to stabilize economic relations from the fourth quarter of the year 1991 at the achieved level, so as not to permit a complete collapse of the economy.

Perhaps we come now to the last group of questions about which I wanted to speak. Examining all these problems, we must not be diverted and we must not forget that we are getting closer to the standards and rules of a law-governed state, respect for the law and the resolutions of the Supreme Soviet. One of the major expressions of the democratic process taking place in our society was the decision of the First USSR Congress of People's Deputies that the congress should take upon itself all the fullness of state power in the country. It has not yet shared this fullness with anyone, including part of the draft program of recovery of the economy and its emergence from the economic crisis. I return to the resolution of the Second Congress of People's Deputies on the government program, which I have already quoted. I will quote a few more provisions from it: The congress instructs the Council of Ministers to draft and submit in 1990 for examination in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of bills on the USSR State Bank, the banking system, investment activity, and employment and other legislative acts. The government has, as you know, carried out this function, and has submitted them for examination to the Supreme Soviet. This resolution states further: In the first half of the year 1990 preparatory work should be completed on the revision of wholesale and purchase prices and the revision should come into force at the beginning of 1991.

I do not know if the USSR Supreme Soviet is empowered to adopt a program amending a decision of the Congress of People's Deputies. Moreover, if we are talking about the holding of any referendum, whether it concerns the question of land, or the future national state or the social system of the USSR, in keeping with the USSR Constitution the holding of a referendum in the country is reserved for the exclusive competence of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. The question arises—it arose very recently—that a body which has been created like the Committee on Constitutional Supervision cannot in full measure carry out its functions, since its powers are limited and it is not capable now of stopping the adoption of anti-constitutional laws and other legislative acts leading to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Evidently, all this poses the question of the need to bring forward the convocation of the Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies, or the possible holding of an extraordinary congress possessing the supreme state power in the country and being capable of resolving the whole set of contradicitons and conflicts arising during the implementation of the program envisaged by it.

Farmers' Union Opposes Plan

LD1709172290 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Ivan Ivanov, Andre Orlov, Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—The economic reform plans submitted to the national parliament last week became the subject of scrupulous analysis by parliament members at today's session.

Debates centered around the plan prepared by the Shatalin group, known as the 500 days plan. Speakers differed radically in their attitude to the plan, some calling for its immediate implementation, others blasting it in no uncertain terms.

On behalf of the Soviet Farmers' Union Vasiliy Starodubtsev expressed disapproval of the Shatalin plan. He said it envisages another act of violence against farmers, will deal a well-considered blow to collective farming and unleash the unbridled forces of the market.

Starodubtsev insisted that the transition to a market economy should not put a brake on the revival and renewal of farming but should stimulate them in all possible ways, especially as agriculture needs being rescued at this moment.

He proposed submitting all plans for the transition to a market economy for a nationwide discussion. Otherwise, Starodubtsev said, "we shall feel obliged to convoke an extraordinary congress of peasants".

Deputy Vladimir Samarin described Starodubtsev's intervention as "speechifying at a rally." He reminded the parliament that the Shatalin plan did not contain a single word calling for dismantling strong collective farms. He voiced support for the 500 days plan and stressed its stage-by-stage nature which enables people to keep a close watch over the implementation of the plan.

Many deputies appeared to be dissatisfied by the work of the conciliatory commission which had been entrusted with creating a combined version of the two plans submitted by the government and the Shatalin groups.

Deputy Nikolay Terniuk even called on his colleagues to collectively work out a third version of the economic reform plan in order to avoid an inroad into "wild capitalism."

He insisted that the third version should be based on a revision of the economic management system and the creation of a taxation system which will help economic regulation and self-regulation.

Deputy Vladimir Voblikov favoured "emergency measures for the transition period". In addition he proposed creating "new executive structures with emergency powers."

Voblikov said it was necessary to avoid "a new chaos in the country" and "create guarantees of national securtity during the transition period".

Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the parliamentary economic reform committee which coordinated efforts to work out alternative economic reform plans, stressed the need to sharply increase powers vested in the legislature as a need condition to secure the success of the economic reform.

He read a draft resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet which said, among other things, that "for purposes of stabilising the country's economy, introducing market relations, strengthening law and order and protecting the rights of citizens, the Soviet president is empowered to solve problems envisaged in Point 7 of Article 113 of the USSR Constitution and issue respective decrees".

The draft resolution contains a call on all parties, public organisations and movements "to support the efforts by the Supreme Soviet and the president of the USSR."

The Supreme Soviet is expected to make its final decision on the issue by October 1, after the plans have been discussed in all Soviet republics, autonomies and parliamentary committees and commissions.

Lukyanov Speaks on Armenian Hunger Strikers

LD1709214290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Speech by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov at the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 17 September in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Sixteen deputies of the 52 who registered have spoken. Now a few words in conclusion on the following issue—I have received a number of notes, and I just need to consult with you. The first note: The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has examined the Shatalin program. They have adopted it but made quite a lot of remarks. I expect that their experience is not without its use for us, so I would like to suggest that the conclusions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on Shatalin's program be duplicated and distributed in the committees.

The second note is rather disturbing: We have received, with a feeling of profound worry, a report on a political hunger strike by our colleagues, People's Deputies Balayan, Ambartsumyan, Sarkisyan and Grigoryan. The hunger strike by the very elderly Academician Viktor Amazaspovich Ambartsumyan is particularly life-threatening. The demand of the strikers is well known—the restoration of Soviet power in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Meanwhile, the USSR Supreme Soviet is keeping silent on this issue. Indifference to the fate of our comrades seems immoral to us. Something must be done.

This is what I would like to say to you, comrades: On 12 September there was a meeting between the USSR president, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet; Comrade Nishanov was there, and the leadership of Armenia and Azerbaijan, headed both by the presidents, the chairmen of the supreme soviets and the chairmen of the councils of ministers. As a result of an over three-hour long exchange of views, certain progress was achieved in establishing contacts between these republics, including progress on issues connected with the situation in the NKAO.

The talks made very difficult progress, but I must say that something was achieved. In these conditions, one is of course disappointed that our esteemed comrades have resorted to a hunger strike as a solution to this problem. We are concerned, naturally, both for their lives and for their health, and of course we are interested in the normalization of the situation in the NKAO and the restoration of Soviet power there being speeded up. What is needed to this end is agreement bewteen the two republics. There is now some movement in this.

On 15 September, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed a letter to Academician Ambartsumyan and the other deputies. This is to let you know that we have not ignored this matter. At the same time, he was addressed by Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Presidium of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. They have passed their letter to me. We discussed this matter on Saturday in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session. The Presidium has addressed an urgent request to the people's deputies to cease their hunger strike and to try to achieve their aims by other methods. I think that this should find understanding from all of us people's deputies.

That is what I think, and I think that all the comrades will join with us in our appeal. We have run into these questions many times at session here. We know how complicated they are, and this, in my view, is no way to resolve them. We must approach this matter from a humane standpoint and from the standpoint of common sense. You do not object, do you, comrades? May we appeal to them on your behalf? [murmurs of assent] Very well.

Merits of Rival Economic Programs Weighed

904A0595A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 Sep 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Presidential Council member V. Yarin and USSR Supreme Soviet member R. Medvedev by A. Kozhakhmetov; place and date not given: "There Are No Ideal Programs"]

[Text] From the first minutes of the plenary session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Monday it became clear that the deputies, "heated up" by numerous meetings with voters during the parliamentary recess, were not about to don the masks of the forsworn and carry on calmly rubber-stamping law after law.

The more so since the voters, tired of standing in lines for bread, tobacco, and everything else, are demanding decisive action from the parliamentarians. And so, has the lance been broken again? Will there be another battle in the parliament? What can we expect from this session? This is what V. Yarin, member of the Presidential Council, and R. Medvedev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, think.

[Yarin] I am sorry that the appeal from our chairman A.I. Lukyanov, who said "Let us get to work!" is still hanging in the air. We have been so carried away by analysis of the approaches to various questions that we are making no headway at all. But the most important thing of all must be decided: Do we or do we not switch to a market economy? Do we finally make the individual an owner, or do we not? I fear that we may again get bogged down in talks and statements of various kinds and not take any real steps.

[Kozhakhmetov] It has been suggested that the deputies include about 30 items on the agenda. In your opinion, how many of them could be called priority items?

[Yarin] I could not single them out now. One thing is clear: The laws that can wait must be set aside. And the main issue of the day must be resolved—adopting a program for the switch to a market economy. We can endure no longer, the country is in such a bad way and we are living so poorly! If we want to take really radical steps to extricate the economy from crisis we must give the most serious consideration to the program worked out by S. Shatalin's group. It is a serious and well-considered document and, moreover, it is a collective piece of work on which representatives of the Union republics also worked.

It is true that there are significant disagreements between the draft from the all-Union government and that which the Russian parliament is now debating. I do not exclude the possibility that a generalized version will be adopted—a version that would reflect all the better and more constructive points of the two drafts.

[Kozhakhmetov] What is your attitude toward the demand from the parliamentary opposition to initiate a vote of no confidence in the Union government?

[Yarin] Confidence in the USSR Cabinet of Ministries is falling. The indecisiveness and half-heartedness of its actions are irritating people. But I personally would not like to have the entire cabinet driven out and for us to be deprived of leaders such as Minister of Internal Affairs V. Bakatin or Health Minister I. Denisov. Perhaps the government really is in a state of confusion, but we should not forget that it has been given the task of solving some extremely difficult problems.

[Kozhakhmetov] What hopes do you place in the present session?

[Yarin] I have just one hope: That as we move into the new year (after all, only three months of this year remain) the country's parliament should do everything possible to enable each person to feel more confident and calm.

[Medvedev] We will not get through this without a clash of opinions in the USSR Supreme Soviet; this is normal. It is something else that is more a cause for concern: As a result of the disputes, will we resolve the most important economic problems and will a Union treaty be concluded? As yet the process is still moving, as before, in a centrifugal manner on the national plane, and it is exerting a destructive effect on our economy. Accordingly, the main thing now is to promote a centripetal force in the republics.

Perhaps this fourth session of the parliament will represent a breakthrough in this regard. In any event, we must understand that a new economic year starts on 1 January and it is essential to adopt a five-year plan, otherwise the country's economy will collapse. Whether we want this or not, without a properly defined plan for the five-year period and for a year our economy will not operate.

[Kozhakhmetov] You take the risk of being out of date when you talk about the plan when the item on the agenda is the market.

[Medvedev] You cannot counterpose one to the other. There are no plans in America, are there? Or in Korea? Korea has broken through and occupied a leading place in the world economy because they strictly implemented five-year plans there. The market necessarily assumes some kind of approximate plan because without this it is impossible to organize the thousands of different parts, and no major enterprise operates without a plan.

[Kozhakhmetov] Which of the two plans for the transition to the market do you prefer?

[Medvedev] Neither. I am familiar with the basics of both programs and in my opinion they suffer from major defects. The plan proposed by the government is more cautious and has been adapted to the ministers' level of understanding of the problems facing the country. Yes, it does happen that this program would seem to be the one for the government, but we cannot ignore the viewpoint of people who would have to implement it.

As far as S. Shatalin's plan is concerned, it is more radical and bold, but it contains so many risk elements that the failure of any one of them would destroy the entire plan. It fails to take into account the subjective and objective factors of our life. Some points in the draft are built on propositions that have no scientific basis. Let us assume the sale of billions of rubles of stock. But what if the public does not want to buy stock? What if it has no confidence in any government? You understand that the people will not invest their rubles just because they trust Gorbachev, or Yeltsin, or Shatalin. Or, for example, the plan to count on foreign credits. But what if no one will provide them, what then? I found no answers to these questions in the draft.

It is difficult to talk about some symbiosis of the two plans. The material is too sophisticated—the market. We have such a poor understanding of the essential nature of the market that we are constantly trying to oversimplify it: accept it, but combine the incompatible. It is unbelievably difficult to create a market. The switch from the market to the command system effected in its time turned out to be easier than reversing the process.

I would like to emphasize that I do not now see competent people capable of creating a real program for switching from a command economy to a market economy. All the calculations must necessarily be underpinned by a science that we do not possess. We do not now know how serious the scientific conclusions are, how serious the views of Shatalin or Petrakov, Aganbegyan or Ryzhkov. But I am not prepared to build the fate of the country on the predilections of a particular economist or politician. In short, no matter how we fight now in the Supreme Soviet for any particular program, we will not find an ideal one. Any program will contain a major element of subjectivism, and the population of the country would have to pay dearly for that.

Decision on Economic Program Expected 26 Sep

LD1709221390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2046 GMT 17 Sep 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Soviet parliament is continuing its quest for the most acceptable path to a market economy. The discussion of the program will continue for at least a week. It is intended that the final decision will be adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet tentatively on 26 September.

Session Resumes 18 Sep; Gorbachev Takes Part

LD1809080690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0635 GMT 18 Sep 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Andrey Orlov from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Sep— The USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing discussion of documents connected with the country's transition to the market today. Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, are taking part in the work.

Today's discussion began with answers to deputies' questions by the authors of the alternative drafts of the transition to the market—Academicians Abel Aganbegyan, Stanislav Shatalin, and Leonid Abalkin. Yesterday they addressed the parliamentarians, substantiating their approaches.

Deputies Receive Responses to 17 Sep Proceedings

LD1809100390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 18 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Today USSR Supreme Soviet deputies are expected to continue debating the three programs which have been submitted: Here is a video report on what is happening in the Hall of Sessions.

[Video shows session in progress, Gorbachev and Ryzhkov present, Lukyanov speaking] Opening today's sitting, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov told deputies:

[Begin recording] [Lukyanov] By this morning we had already received very many responses at the Supreme Soviet—cables, telephone calls, and letters—to our sitting yesterday. I have to say that the majority of these responses from people note the constructive and calm nature of the speeches, which make it possible to appraise what is being proposed both by our government and our academic circles, as well as what is being proposed by the USSR president from all sides, and all this is said in these. One telegram quotes Diderot, saying that one should truly like criticism, that one can only benefit from it.

Taking part in our session today are Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers, members of the Presidential Council and the government and the other bodies we are forming. As we agreed, we are continuing to consider the matter of urgent measures to stabilize the country's national economy and to make the transition to a controlled market economy. [end recording]

[Announcer] Anticipating today's debates, in reply to the question as to which of the country's executive bodies would be responsible to the USSR Supreme Soviet for the implementation of the program conceived by Shatalin, Academician Aganbegyan expressed his point of view.

[Begin Aganbegyan recording] A headquarters should be set up to carry out the measures to stabilize the transition to the market headed by the president, which should sit every week, including in it the chairman of the Council of Ministers as the deputy leader of all that direct work. And it seems to me that it is expedient to preserve for the leadership of that work the tandem of the president and chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] because together Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, according to data of a study, of a representative study of the whole country which was carried out by the center under the leadership of Tatyana Ivanovna Zaslavskaya, they enjoy the trust of over 80 percent of the population. [end recording]

[Announcer] Academicians Shatalin and Abalkin also adressed replies to the deputies' questions. Then the discussion continued on the urgent measures to stabilize the country's economy and on the program of the transition to the market.

First Week of Supreme Soviet Session Appraised

PM1809095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Article by parliamentary observer Miroslav Buzhkevich under the rubric "Parliamentary Week": "Realities of Power and Power of Realities"]

[Text] The first week's work of the latest USSR Supreme Soviet session could have been far more productive. What parliament could have spent one day on, given businesslike and considered preparation, in practice took two days of plenary sittings and brought the deputies a sense of disappointment, grievance, and even irritation rather than a sense of satisfaction.

This was particularly noticeable Tuesday, when problems of the transition to a market economy were discussed. Apart from the speech by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the country's Council of Ministers, from which it was possible to discern only the "framework" of the government program, the parliamentarians essentially received no information about the planned measures to put the national economy on a market footing. They were told that the program of the group formed by joint decision of M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, which is commonly called Academician S. Shatalin's group, had not reached the USSR Supreme Soviet, although, at the same time, it had already been approved in the Russian parliament. It came to light that this book of almost 12 printer's sheets, which was signed to press 5 September, had been published in 50,000 copies by the "Detskaya Kniga" Association of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade. However, the Union parliament's deputies received it only toward the end of the third day of the session, 12 September. The presidential version of the draft program for stabilizing the economy and going over to the market, which takes account of the government's elaborations and also of the recommendations of Academician A. Aganbegyan's commission, which examined other alternative versions of the transition to a market economy, was also received by the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions only toward Wednesday evening.

No wonder the parliamentarians refused to discuss this very important problem 11 September, after N.I. Ryzhkov's speech. I will repeat, they were unable to tackle this the next day too—there were still no documents. Some deputies are inclined to account for everything that happened by referring to incomprehensible backstage "games," hinting that all these delays play into someone's hands. I do not know, for I do not possess such information. But the majority of deputies displayed worthy firmness and evaluated what had happened as the result of insufficiently clear preparation of this question by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

However, it would be unobjective to place a period here. Unfortunately, far from all deputies are ready for businesslike cooperation with their colleagues, with that same Supreme Soviet Presidium. The latter, for example, twice discussed the agenda of the upcoming session. At its first sitting, however, an alternative version of this agenda appeared, although the authors had had time to prepare this document beforehand and to submit it to the Presidium well in advance. Then sharp and at times fruitless clashes of opinions would not have arisen at the plenary sitting, and there would have been no need for the conciliation commission, through whose endeavors both documents were combined into a single session agenda only on the second day of the session.

Finally, all the reefs were bypassed, the deputies were armed with the necessary documents, and on Thursday work began on them in parliamentary committees and commissions. However, a very delicate question at once arose. The thing is that, speaking in parliament, M.S. Gorbachev said that he was more impressed with the draft of Academician S. Shatalin's working group. A certain section of the deputies, who evidently have not yet given up their former life style, regarded those words as deciding the matter in advance. Why waste time and effort on debating, they said, when everything is already clear? Shatalin's program has already been approved by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session and is supported by the president. Is there any need to bother with the government's elaborations?

Moreover, although the session rejected the proposals for the government's resignation expressed by A. Obolenskiy on behalf of the group of social democratic parliamentarians, N.I. Ryzhkov, the government's head, declared very firmly that he and his colleagues had no intention of realizing someone else's program. Does this mean that resignation will still take place? It is demanded, in particular, by many Russian parliamentarians. At the same time the USSR Supreme Soviet is receiving thousands of telegrams in defense of N.I. Ryzhkov. There is no denying that this is pluralism in action!

To the credit of the majority of parliamentarians, they did not yield to the temptation of an easy choice but set about a detailed and in-depth study and comparison of the proposed programs. But here too there were unexpected surprises.

The Committee for Economic Reform Questions (Chairman V. Vologzhin) invited a group of scientists from the Scientific Research Institute of Economics of the Ministry of the Aviation Industry under the leadership of Dr. of Technical Sciences Prof. A. Isayev, which made a comparison of the government's program and the "500 Days" program, which was approved by the Russian parliament and included in the document prepared by Academician S. Shatalin's group.

The conclusions came as a total surprise to those gathered there. In the reviewers' opinion, neither of these programs will lead to the creation of a fully fledged market. The government concept proceeds from traditionally centrist positions, virtually ignores the growing centrifugal trends, and gives no idea of its authors' views on the substance of the future Union treaty or on political, economic, and military relations among the sovereign Union states.

While preferring the "500 Days" program, which, in their opinion, contains many important and useful points, at the same time the reviewers pointed out that it represents another extreme. It is, in point of fact, a manifesto for a transition to the market in one specific republic. "The designation of the Union's function in a number of sections," the conclusion by the scientists of the Aviation Industry Ministry's Scientific Research Institute of Economics states, "appears in a number of instances like an artificial superstructure over the tasks entrusted to the republic. Such "cosmetic repairs" to the originally purely republican version of the program did not make it possible—nor could they have done so—to create a version of the program which resolves in full the whole range of the Union's problems." Hence the conclusion: Any program for the transitional period to the market must contain proposals on the procedure for preparing and concluding the Union treaty and on its contents and be based on its main points.

The reviewers dispute in a detailed and well-reasoned manner the claims by the authors of both programs that their elaborations open up the most correct path to a market economy. This is not the place to cite those arguments. They are clearly a subject for a special article. I will merely point out one thing: The scientists from the Aviation Industry Ministry's Scientific Research Institute of Economics did not confine themselves to criticizing their colleagues' work but also proposed their own version of the transition to the market—the "Parity" program, which contains quite a lot that is tempting. And it would be manifestly unwise to reject it. The appearance on the economic horizon of the concept of A. Isayev's group will, maybe, influence the very choice of the program of future reforms.

This was the unexpected turn on the "market front." What are the parliamentarians to do now? On the one hand, the "500 Days," according to the assurances of the Russian Federation's leaders, will "start working" as of 1 October. But doubts were expressed at the session of the Union parliament as to whether the Supreme Soviets of the other Union and autonomous republics will by then have time to examine and approve the all-Union program for the transition to the market. Thus, will the economic reform begin in one republic taken separately? But how will this affect the life of the country as a whole and of other republics?

I will now touch on another topic. The CPSU has recently been subjected to increasingly fierce criticism and, frequently, simply to malicious attacks. There is no denying that our party has made many mistakes and must account for them to the people and take very effective steps to strengthen its prestige among the masses. However, one sad feature draws attention to itself. Those who consider it their indispensable duty to "kick" the party include quite a few individuals who in the past linked their destiny with it, found their feet with its help, and got on in the world, as the saying goes. But now, at a difficult time for it, they have demonstratively broken with it. And they are exposing the party apparatus from which they themselves emerged. There are also such people among people's deputies. Here is just one example. A former secretary of a large party committee, who has now become a social democrat, is demanding an investigation into the CPSU's "unconstitutional" activity.

Of course, anyone's views can change—this must not be condemned. But people must not turn into Ivans who have forgotten their ancestry. Only a few years ago many of the party's present exposers were doing all they could with a clear conscience to please the leaders of "stagnation" and the conduits of corruption, and together with them they violated laws and took all sorts of privileges—considerable ones—as their due. But today, from rostrums of varying caliber, they pontificate about Communist deceivers, making out that they themselves are pure and honest people. How is it possible to trust them?

Real power in the state today is a hostage of the power of realities, of the stormy events of which our life is full: political confrontation, economic arrhythmia, the threat of thrombosis in many sectors of the national economy, and interethnic clashes.

Therefore, whatever program for the transition to the market the country's parliament chooses, it can only be fulfilled if a firm rule is established for the next 18-24 months: Republican organs must not adopt decisions which run counter to existing Union laws and the tasks of the program being implemented. What is also needed is public concord and, figuratively speaking, a truce among political parties and public movements. At this difficult time a very great deal depends on wisdom, flexibility of thinking, and the worthy fulfillment of their duty to the people by deputies of all soviets, including members of the Union parliament. Its fourth session has only just begun. We are all waiting for its work and the decisions which it will adopt to bring us closer to stabilization and then also to the enhancement of our life.

Political & Social

Reports Continue on 16 Sep Anti-Goverment Rally

Shatalin on Constitution

LD1809083390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 18 Sep 90

[Text] Now news relating to Sunday's sensational events: The demonstration and meeting held on 16 September in

Moscow were a statement of the will of the people and were not against the country's Constitution, Presidential Council member Shatalin has told an INTERFAX agency correspondent in an interview. He replied in the negative to a question asking if he believes the demonstration was actually in support of him and meant that his draft for the transition to the market has already won the day. First, Shatalin stressed, no one was demonstrating for me; and second, I am not very fond of the terms won and lost. Only the people should win, and this winning must manifest itself in an improvement in their living standard.

'Radical Transition' Sought

LD1709114990 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Excerpts] In Moscow there has been a manifestation that developed into a meeting on a square near the Kremlin Wall. The action was organized by some of the democratic movements in Moscow and in the Russian Federation. Some members of the national parliament have identified themselves with the demands that were laid down. Our correspondents elaborate. First, Vitaliy Gurov. He writes the following:

Moscow seems to be getting used to massive, what's more, informal processions prompted by social, economic, and political problems. Still, this has been a special manifestation. People were demanding energetic actions to stabilize the national economy, adopt market relations at an early date, and the resignation of the national government. [passage omitted]

My colleagues who marched with the demonstrators say most people were calling for the government's resignation and voicing support for Boris Yeltsin. Only a few slogans sounded provocative inasmuch as they censured perestroyka and were insulting to the Soviet president. [passage omitted]

A member of the Russian Federation's parliament, (Viktor Agsuchev), has this to say:

[Begin (Agsuchev) recording in Russian fading into English translation] A politician feeling moral responsiblity for the country should take care to avoid a left or a right turn, which are equally dangerous. It's this moral responsibility which is urging all of Russia's freedom-loving forces to rally together today. We must bring forth what unites rather than divides us. [end recording]

And yet Radio Moscow reporters got an impression that many speakers were calling for something different from unity. A lot was said about the parliament's inability to take constructive decisions, and cabinet members were accused of caring more for their official posts than for the nation's future.

But, summing up the pronouncements and suggestinos voiced in Moscow's Manege Square on that rainy Sunday night [16 September]. One can say they all boil down to the idea that Nikolay Ryzhkov's government no longer enjoyed the support of Soviet voters, and that most people were in favor of the radical transition to a market suggested by President Mikhail Gorbachev and the head of the Russian Federation's parliament, Boris Yeltsin.

Ryzhkov Greets Tashkent Islamic Conference

LD1509103190 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 15 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov sent a message of greetings to an international Islamic conference, which opened in the Uzbek capital of Tashkent on Friday.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, he congratulated participants in the conference on the 1,200th anniversary of the birth of Islamic philosopher Imam al-Termezi.

"The Soviet Government promotes the development of relations between Soviet Muslims and the Islamic world, which have been growing with every year," Ryzhkov's message said.

In this connection, it pointed to the importance of the Hajj to Mecca by hundreds of Soviet Muslims, organised by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"We welcomed the friendly gesture by Saudi King Fahd who presented Soviet Muslims with one million copies of the Koran. We are confident that contacts and cooperation between Muslims in the Soviet Union and other countries will continue to develop for humane purposes and in the interests of peace among nations," the message said.

Weekly's Poll on Views of CPSU Criticized

PM1709123590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof. V. Boykov under the rubric "From a Sociologist's Viewpoint": "Will for Civil Consensus"]

[Text] Moscow—Experience shows that no reforms will make headway unless society emerges from the period of legal nihilism, ethnic strife, and ultimatum-type actions, which not only worry people greatly and distract them from work but also confront the country with the threat of chaos. In these conditions every initiative for civil reconciliation for the sake of progress and in the name of man is tremendously important. The 28th CPSU Congress displayed such an initiative. It is expressed in its program statement.

But does the Communist Party today possess the necessary measure of popular trust to unite people? What should be done in order to achieve success? Opinions in this regard are extremely diverse. And, unfortunately, they are not always objective. Even when they are supposedly based on scientific, and in particular sociological, data.

Thus the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI (29 July 1990) cited the results of a poll of the population carried out by the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion. The results are used to illustrate people's mixed view of the 28th congress (the poll was carried out during the congress) and the party as a whole.

For instance, one respondent in four expects that the forum will significantly influence the future of the CPSU and the country as a whole. One-half believe that it will not significantly affect the situation, and the rest are "do not knows." Asked "Do you agree that the CPSU is the only force capable of extricating our country from the crisis?" 18 percent replied in the affirmative, and 64 percent in the negative (admittedly, the party lays no claim to such a "monopoly"). Finally, 41 percent of participants in the poll were opposed to the disbandment of the CPSU, and 31 percent were in favor of its abolition.

Despite the strange formulation of the questions and the leading questions to respondents, the results provide no basis for the comments accompanying them. The comments are couched in terms of a verdict: The people's trust in the party as an organization is falling steadily, the population had no great expectations of the congress, its delegates were more conservative than the party masses, and the party masses are more conservative than the population. Before conclusions were drawn about differences between political positions, positions should at least have been compared by polling delegates, CPSU members, and the population.

What is shown by the data of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Sociological Research Center, which polled congress delegates and the population both before the congress opened and after its conclusion? Some 67 percent of those polled had intended to follow the work of the party forum. But 88 percent actually did follow it, half on television. Judging by the fact that over one-third of those polled entertained hopes that life would change for the better as a result of the congress and that 49 percent were satisfied to some extent or another with its decisions, and also on the basis of other data, the congress certainly did not escape public attention. But the interest in it, and in the party's fate, was not philistine but exacting and critical.

Did the congress change people's attitude toward the party. Probably not, although 32 percent of respondents feel positive about its results, and somewhat fewer—26 percent—feel pessimistic. This breakdown between optimists and pessimists scarcely stemmed from the elements of conservatism among a section of the delegates, which certainly did exist. For the sake of clarity regarding impressions of real views, let us compare participants in the party forum, CPSU members, and nonparty people with respect to topical questions of perestroyka.

Among delegates 84 percent, among CPSU members 77 percent, and among nonparty people 64 percent regard the development of the private sector of the economy as permissible. Among delegates 65 percent, among CPSU members 60 percent, and among nonparty people 47 percent support the development of cooperatives. Among delegates 66 percent, among CPSU members 49 percent, and among nonparty people 32 percent believe that, in moving toward the market, we are moving toward the fuller realization of socialism's potential. Among delegates 83 percent, among CPSU members 61 percent, and among nonparty people 39 percent want the party to be renewed, to "move to the left," and to be rejuvenated (one-third of nonparty people were "do not knows," but 30 percent wanted the party to be preserved in its former capacity). Among delegates 80 percent, among CPSU members 57 percent, and among nonparty people 36 percent see the CPSU as the party of the consolidation of all strata of society (one in five nonparty people believes that the party should be the political organization of the working class).

If you combine the results of the poll of delegates with the results of the votes [at the congress], which were conducted more than 250 times on various provisions of the documents, it demonstrates yet again that their political will was tuned in to the radical changes in the party and society.

In saying this, I would like to stress that the civil consensus which we need so badly is not only an essential condition for emerging from the crisis. Its meaning is deeper than just another "slogan of the day" or current problems. Without it there is no and can be no civilized society. A society in which strong-arm methods of pressure do not reign, but the mechanism of consensus operates. In other words, it is incorrect to display a purely pragmatic approach toward building the new civil home, that is, to destroy others in order to occupy a more spacious apartment in that home, and the same goes for the conclusion of alliances dictated by short-term expediency. People are tired not only of social disarray, but also of the ineffectiveness of power and the ambitious fight for it. Some 53 percent of people whom we polled no longer have hopes of anyone's assistance in protecting their interests, and 61 percent expressed serious anxiety at the growing political confrontation in regions and in society as a whole.

The results of the surveys show that people's recent predominant desire to smash the command system, abolish swollen bureaucratic management structures, and pull major and minor princelings from their pedestals is increasingly often developing into a desire to acquire a political support capable of holding out in the face of anarchy and preventing society from drowning in its quagmire. It is in this connection that hopes are pinned on the renewed soviets and on the withdrawal of the CPSU from self-isolation (but as yet these hopes are poorly vindicated).

One of the most essential reasons for the CPSU's negative image and the decline in its attractiveness in people's eyes is the lack of vivid new ideas and concepts capable of attracting and inspiring broad strata of the population. The transformation of Marxism-Leninism from a working theory into a sacred text and the ruthless exploitation of communist ideals did the party a disservice. The fact that there are no other alternative theories enjoying any serious recognition in no way saves the situation. The resultant spiritual vacuum weakens both party members and the CPSU's role in society. It is no accident that 61 percent of the 4,000 polled 28th CPSU Congress delegates were negative in their assessment of the state of party theoretical work in the development of perestroyka. As we can see, this is confirmation of the historical correctness of V.I. Lenin, who believed that the role of advanced fighter could be played only by a party guided by advanced theory.

Specialists Forecast CPSU Budget Deficit

LD1509224190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2138 GMT 15 Sep 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] According to some estimates, the shortfall in the CPSU budget could reach R1.5 billion this year.

A number of specialists are calling now for the party to become more actively involved in commercial activities.

Ligachev Promises 'Whole Truth' in Book

PM1709084090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by V. Dolganov and A. Stepovoy on interview with Ye. K. Ligachev at the USSR Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions; date not given: "Yegor Ligachev: 'Soon I Shall Tell the Whole Truth'"]

[Text] In unison the TV cameras turned away from Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev immediately after the 28th CPSU Congress. He used to be a leader—but no longer. However, the readers have not forgotten Yegor Kuzmich. Very many are interested in what he is doing now and what kind of life is being led by this man, who until a few weeks ago was unofficially considered the second most important politician in the USSR.

Yegor Kuzmich does not hide from journalists; indeed, these days he consistently occupies a place intended for the press on the balcony of the Hall of Sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. He is happy and sociable, bright and cheerful, and invariably accessible. He has no bodyguard.

"I was always exacting in work," Yegor Kuzmich recalled on the parliamentary balcony, amiably addressing the few journalists sitting alongside. "This did not just apply to others—I was demanding on myself, first of all; I never spared myself, and I worked unaware of the time or of how tired I was. Now they are saying that I foisted my opinion on the press, that I persecuted people and demanded that people be punished. This is untrue. I always believed that the newspapers must be independent and have the right to voice their own opinion. Yes, I was exacting, but I never pressured people..."

We asked about the present official position of the recent CPSU Central Committee secretary and Politburo member.

"I do not know," Ligachev laughed, almost with embarrassment. "I have not handed in my resignation, no one has asked me to. I get no calls."

But this man, a former leader of the initiation of perestroyka (remember his recognition at the 19th party conference of the people "who brought Gorbachev to power"?), does not intend to add the prefix "ex-" to his political status. And he is fully resolved to continue his civic activity. He confided that he neither likes nor is capable of squandering his time, which he is now devoting virtually entirely to his new book.

"I know many things about many people and I can say a lot about things which previously I was duty bound to keep to myself. This will be my fifth book, not a theoretical work this time but current affairs with a bias toward memoir. In it I am going to tell the whole truth about many things. I am writing it myself; I am not used to having a ghost writer as others do. With past books comrades helped me collect materials and information. Now I am working alone. I control my pen. And I shall keep all the draft manuscripts so that those who want to can check for themselves that I am writing it all myself. Work is progressing. Where will I have the book published? I do not know yet but I think that there will be quite a few interested publishers and not only in our country. Look, my pockets are full of calling cards. When I have written it we shall decide. At the moment I am turning down most of the foreign correspondents' requests for interviews—I am concentrating on the book, as I have said, and I do not want to be diverted until I have finished it. I think that will be soon."

Of course, we were bound to ask how Yegor Kuzmich sees the life of the country and parliament from a viewpoint other than that to which he had been accustomed for many years.

"But I always knew the real state of things, though. What can I tell you? The country has reached a very complex situation. Very complex... You ask how I see the way out? (There is a long pause, then the tolerant smile of an elderly man.) I will tell you this. I have faith in the people and in Russia. The people have lived through so much in the past 50 years... And overcome everything... They knew the False Dmitriy in Moscow [17th century pretender to throne] and threw him out... And so on...

Perhaps I am answering in generalizations, but truthfully, I have faith in the people."

Readers are an inquisitive lot. We are no exception. And therefore we very much hope that the book will truthfully and accurately reflect, for example, the personal participation of the author of these publicistic memoirs in the Great Antialcohol Campaign. As well as the story of the appearance of the Nina Andreyeva article, and the recommendations "from above" that it be reprinted in other papers and studied in the political enlightenment system which, deprived of Yegor Kuzmich's patronage, has now died a natural death. It would also be very interesting to know his thoughts on the "vivifying strength" of the collective farm system because although we have heard a lot about it from Ye.K. Ligachev we still cannot understand what happened to the food that was part of people's daily needs.

On the whole there is much we would like from the horse's mouth, as it were, about the author's struggle for the eternal values and unshakable principles which have brought this great country to the brink of total collapse.

And as for the press... The harsh words between leaders at conferences conducted by Ligachev himself or with his active participation on Staraya Ploshchad [CPSU Central Committee headquarters] on the "erroneous position" of certain publications are still fresh in our memories and those of many of our colleagues.

By and large, the people remember everything.

...There was a press conference in the Small Hall. The premier was warding off a swarm of questions. But Yegor Kuzmich, who had to force his way through a throng of reporters who did not see him clearly, walked on, his eyes fixed straight ahead.

Nishanov, Abdulatipov Remark on Union Treaty

LD1509050990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Consultations continued in Moscow today on matters connected with the drafting of the concept for a Union treaty.

[Correspondent V. Stepanyuk] This time, the leaders of autonomous republic met in the Kremlin. Summing up previous meetings, Comrade Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet, noted that thanks to these consultations it had proved possible to formulate new approaches to the drafting of a treaty and a new vision of the future Union of our peoples.

[Nishanov] All of us who have participated in the consultations were of one mind: that the point of departure should be the declarations of sovereignty and independence which have already been adopted by the republics—I can say here, by the Union republics and the autonomous republics. And the principles incorporated in these declarations should also be the basis for the drawing up of a Union treaty.

[Stepanyuk] In the view of the parties to the meeting, when the future treaty is concluded the Union and autonomous republics should be federation members enjoying full rights. On the whole, the leaders of the autonomous republics spoke up for unification on federal principles and for the preservation of our Union state. I think that the mood of the parties to the meeting was expressed in the most precise and graphic manner by Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Russian parliament.

[Abdulatipov] There is a period underway today in which people are coming to know themselves and be aware of themselves, when people are genuinely acquiring their self respect. And it is important to channel this self respect into proper relations, so that this self respect is not just emphasized for oneself, for one's own people, and for one's individual self, and that this self respect is the self respect of a person who is a citizen of our country irrespective of the republic in which he lives.

Constitution Panel Discusses Residence Permits

PM1409140090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by L. Nikitinskiy: "Home Truths"]

[Text] On 12 September the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee met for its regular working session, to examine the question of whether existing rules on residence permits conform to the country's constitution. But the central newspapers' correspondents who went to the session in the hope of providing an on-the-spot reportage on the latest battle for democracy were rather disappointed: There was no fight. The "author" of the main provisions on residence permits—the USSR Council of Ministers—itself preferred to retreat hastily to alternate positions, and literally on the eve of the session lifted a number of the most hated bans on residence permits. Also all the labels reading "secret," "not for the press," and so forth were removed from the relevant documents and instructions (as we reported briefly the day before yesterday).

All that was secret shall be revealed, the scriptures say. Stripped of the fig leaf of secrecy, the former secrets appear in all their flagrant absurdity and foolishness.

In addition, of course, to the well-known ban on residence permits in the most attractive cities and localities for people with previous convictions for certain crimes, it seems that until last Monday a whole series of other rules were still formally in effect, rules that allowed the militia organs, with no trial or investigation, to drive citizens away "beyond the 101st kilometer." Thus, in certain conditions it was permitted to expel through administrative proceedings not only prostitutes and black-marketeers who bought things from foreigners, but also peaceful participants in religious and "other meetings and street marches violating public order," and even people "observed behaving in an unbecoming manner." Whatever the motivation for such rules may have been, their unconstitutional nature needs no commentary.

Since the minimum program set by the Constitutional Oversight Committee had been fulfilled, the committee confined itself to taking note of the USSR Council of Ministers decision, but decided in the month of October, after a broad and open discussion of the existing residence rules, which have now become public knowledge, to come back to the question of their compliance with the constitution.

After all, as was stressed in a number of speeches at the committee session, the concession made by the USSR Council of Ministers changed little as regards the real position of many millions of our citizens. Rigorous restrictions remain on residence permits in the cities that young, energetic workers dream of. As before, Moscow, Leningrad, the capitals of the union republics, and other major cities and resort cities will not, for the time being, accept people without residence permits to work there. And, most important, residence registration remains a matter of permission being granted, which offers scope for tyranny by officials.

Of course, this question has, apart from its legal aspect, a purely practical side too. The institution of residence permits, as a pillar of the administrative edict system, has become an integral part of our public life over many decades. This system, redolent of a police state and serfdom, at the same time fulfills a number of objectively necessary distributive functions today, and here nothing can take its place immediately.

The majority of the specialists who spoke at the committee session believe that the institution of residence permits will, in the near or not so near future, develop from a matter of administrative permission into a matter of registration pure and simple, as is customary in the majority of civilized countries. It was also said that the cunning system of residence permits has demonstrated its powerlessness when it comes to sensibly regulating the processes of population migration, succeeding only in distorting these processes in an ugly way.

I personally think that the next step should be to lift the ban on accepting people for work without residence permits, which is contrary to the constitutional equal right to labor for all citizens. If someone is looking for work, the question of where he has found a roof for himself should be no concern of the personnel department. But if we wait until October we will find out what the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee thinks about this.

Biryukova Retires From Deputy Premiership

LD1709164790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] USSR President Gorbachev has released Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova from the post of the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers in connection with her retirement on a pension.

Jewish Oblast Head Leaves Party Post

LD1409080890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0633 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Birobidzhan, 14 Sep (TASS)—Boris Korsunskiy, who headed the CPSU organization of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast, Soviet East, and at the same time held the post of chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies, has left his party post to concentrate his efforts on the activity of leader of the local body of soviet power. Radik Sandik has been relieved of the duties of the second secretary of the oblast party committee at his own request.

A plenum of the oblast CPSU committee, which took place in Birobidzhan, instructed Galina Kulikova to perform the duties of first secretary for the time being. Earlier she worked as a secretary of the committee. The issue of the party organization's leader will be resolved at an oblast conference in November.

Economic

Petrakov on Gorbachev's Role in Shatalin Group

LD1309183190 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 13 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Anorey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow September 13 TASS—The transition of the Soviet economy to a market draws a line under the years of administrative-command management, Nikolay Petrakov, an economic adviser to the Soviet president, told a news conference here today. He said the deep crisis that engulfed the country is a direct result of the baneful methods of management which prevailed in the country for a long time.

Petrakov, a vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is a prominent economist who advocated the transition to a market even during "stagnation years." He became an aide to Gorbachev in early 1990. Petrakov took part in the work of the group, led by Stanislav Shatalin, which was set up on the joint decision of the Soviet and Russian Federation presidents. Its programme has already been endorsed by the Russian parliament and is seen as one of the main variants by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Commenting on the establishment of the group to draft a blueprint for the country's switch to a market economy, Petrakov said "it marked the first time that the government's monopoly on economic programmes has been broken."

The Soviet president "effectively took part" in the work of the team, also known as the "Gorbachev-Yeltsin group," Petrakov said. He spent several hours talking to its members and after the draft was finished, Gorbachev read it with great attention and made several corrections.

Petrakov described as "not quite tactful" the criticism of Shatalin's programme by Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Replying to his allegation that "the implementation of the programme will lead to a sharp rise in prices", Petrakov said this growth" was primarily the result of the disintegrating monetary circulation in the country, which, in turn, was the work of the Union goverment."

Shatalin's programme proceeds from the need to create a stable monetary system, he said. Therefore, it enjoys the support of nearly all Union republics. The Liberalisation of retail prices is to be carried out only after the country's economy is successfully stabilised.

As for the one-off rise in prices with the compensation of losses to the population, the source of such compensation can "only be a printing-press," Petrakov said. If the government programme is endorsed, this will require an additional emission of 30 billion roubles, which is tantamount to increasing the monetary mass by 30 per cent.

Asked "whether the USSR goes to capitalism or socialism" the president's aide replied: "Let's be pragmatists at least in the late 20th century; we need an effective economy in the first place. As for the terminology, we must make the point clear: if it is the socialism which Stalin created, then we are rejecting it."

Gidaspov Cited on Transition to Market Economy

LD1409212290 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 14 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Rachko]

[Text] Leningrad September 15 TASS—"The transition of the Soviet Union to a market economy is the crest of perestroyka and on whether we pass it depends the future," Boris Gidaspov, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and the first secretary of the Leningrad regional party committee, told a news conference in Leningrad on Friday.

He stressed that the Leningrad party organisation recognized private property among other forms of ownership and did not object against privatisation of means of production.

"Ways of switching to a market economy can differ but difficulties, like temporary unemployment and inflation, are inevitable anyway.

"We are on the brink of a social catastrophe and must do everything possible to escape it," Gidaspov said.

He called the creation of a free enterprise zone in Leningrad a "unique large scale experiment." He told the news conference that Leningrad communists fully support this experiment, but noted that a "concept of its performance has yet to be worked out."

On the results of the second stage of the Russian party congress, Gidaspov said that he had awaited a much worse outcome. "I thought that we would leave through different doors. But there was no split, and now communists are becoming increasingly aware of the need for the Russian Communist Party.

"It should, first of all, create a firm basis for itself among workers and gain people's confidence," he said.

Popov, Sobchak Speak at Free Market Conference

LD1309213890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent Vasiliy Borisov on the International Free Market Conference held in Moscow, including recorded remarks by Gavriil Popov, chairman of Moscow Soviet, and Anatoliy Sobchak, chairman of Leningrad Soviet, at the conference]

[Excerpts] Until recently our economists have defended dozens or even more works on the horrors of the free market. They must have studied this free market so well that they realized in the end that the real horror was that we did not have a free market. A conference, an international conference, of free market advocates is being held behind these doors. It started on 10 September at the Hotel Uzka of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The conference of free market advocates was organized by the U.S. Cato Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Central Economic-Mathematics Institute, and the Lomonosov Moscow State University. [passage omitted]

Gavriil Popov, chairman of the Moscow Soviet and a USSR people's deputy, has just come from the sitting of the Supreme Soviet. At the conference he will deliver a report on the distribution of property.

[Popov] It is time to abandon Lenin's concept of soviets, as they have completely failed, and to return to normal parliamentary forms. Second, we have to form an administrative mechanism, which is completely lacking at present. Any plans of Gorbachev or Yeltsin would remain mere literary exercises without this administrative mechanism. Now in the country—if what is written in this plan for a period from day 30 to day 50 is not fulfilled—it will be impossible to find anyone to call to account and ask: Why was this not done? The second major problem of the political reform is to form the administrative mechanism, independent from the legislative bodies of power, which is chosen by the people and which is capable of implementing and enforcing order and discipline in the country. Naturally, there is a third one—it is the forming of judicial authorities. Thus, summing up, I want to say that the elaboration of a new economic plan and the elaboration of a plan for a profound and immediate political reform are major tasks of the modern stage of development.

[Borisov] After Popov's speech Anatoliy Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, took the floor.

[Sobchak] The transfer to a market economy is possible, necessary, and has very good prospects in our country. Above all, I see these prospects in the attraction of foreign investments and the introduction of our economy into the world economy. This process must take place simultaneously. One cannot wait until the economic mechanism is formed, and only then start, so to say, to invest money in the Soviet economy. Then we will manage without you. It is necessary to do it today, and to do it, above all, in order to encourage the processes of privatization and to create the strata of owners on which the new political authorities can lean. If the progam by Shatalin and Yavlinskiy is adopted—and most likely this is the program to be adopted as the program for economic betterment and transfer to the market economy—we will have an opportunity to ensure initial measures toward the convertibility of the ruble in a short period of time—in two to three months—and then the widest possibilities will appear for mutual contacts and mutual work. I would like to thank you again for your attention; I must return to my seat in the Supreme Soviet in order to continue my main work. [applause]

[Borisov] The conference will end tomorrow, but discussion of the ways to develop our economy is not over. We all are awaiting the decision of people's deputies at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Goskomstat Reports 'Man-Days' Lost to Strikes

LD1409100390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Summary] The USSR State Committee for Statistics reports that 10 million man-days were lost in the country due to strikes and mass absenteeism which took place because of interethnic, social, and political conflicts. This is equal to a daily absence of 75,000 people. There were huge losses also because of seminars, meetings, and conferences held during working hours. Due to various meetings and seminars there was a daily absenteeism rate of 400,000 in 1989 and 700,000 in 1987. Hopefully this figure will go down next year, the State Committee for Statistics says.

State Commercial Bank Established in Siberia

LD1409061390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] Almost two dozen enterprises including Krasnoyarsklesprom [Krasnoyarsk timber industry], Krasnoyarskugol [Krasnoyarsk coal], the Scientific Production Association of Applied Mechanics, and the Civilian Aviation Directorate, have become the founders of the State Commercial Bank. The bank is to bolster Siberia's financial independence since up to the present time almost 90 percent of bank profits go to the budget and higher bodies. The fund of the joint-stock, commercial bank of the Yenisey has been determined as just over 1,000 shares, each costing 200,000 rubles, which have been distributed among the bank's founders in accordance with a set undertaking. The bank will become the main creditor in Krasnoyarsk Kray, offering services to both enterprises and cooperatives.

Chelyabinsk Refinery Stops Gasoline Deliveries

LD1709110290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] In the Altay, all "Ural" motor vehicles delivering bread have been parked.

Gasoline stations in Barnaul, Rubtsovsk, Bisk, and rayon centers of the kray have put up notices saying: No gasoline. At the peak of the harvest season, the Chelyabinsk oil refinery, the main supplier, has stopped making gasoline deliveries.

The leaders of the Altaynefteprodukt association are paying futile visits to top departments of the capital.

Agricultural

Novosibirsk Grain Farmers Need Trucks, Drivers

PM1109155190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Sep 90

[Report by V. Tyabotin and A. Tselitskiy from Novosibirsk Oblast, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] in Novosibirsk Oblast are harvesting grain from the second million hectares. Despite the fact that hot dry winds have parched southern rayons, the harvest is expected to be better than last year's on the whole. Many rayons are achieving yields of 16, 17, and even 20 quintals per hectare.

On the Klyuchevskiy Sovkhoz, for instance, a good crop of grain, potatoes, and corn has been grown. And people are happy when work is going well and grain is arriving at threshing floors and moving on, without losses, to reliable storage.

Unfortunately, scenes like this one are no rarity in the oblast either, when on beautiful sunny days combine harvesters are idling because of breakdowns and shortages of spare parts, and especially because of a lack of transport facilities.

It is not just Moscow Oblast truck drivers but also the numerous Novosibirsk enterprises which have undersupplied around 1,000 trucks who are in no hurry to comply with the government decisions on providing assistance to the countryside. And on such days grain growers feel bitter. [passage omitted]

Smolensk Mill Fails To Receive Grain Deliveries

PM1309132090 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 12 Sep 90

[Report of interview with I.F. Voznyuk, director of a grain harvesting company, by V. Vengrzhnovskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The pace of sales of grain to the state by kolkhozes and sovkhozes are virtually the same as last year, which, let me note, was not the best of years. Yet there is no comparison between this year's harvest and last year's. So where is the grain? A report from our Smolensk correspondent contains one answer to this question.

[Reporter] When you look at this short line of grain trucks by the elevators of the Vyazma Grain Products Combine, these empty railroad sidings, do not hurry to draw conclusions about poor organization of the harvesting in Smolensk Oblast. With the harvest in full swing, all at once the millers are working at half strength. Why?

[I.F. Voznyuk] The fact is that in order to produce high-quality flour they supply us with wheat from southern regions of the country—Rostov Oblast, Stavropol Kray. And unfortunately our suppliers are in no hurry to fulfill their delivery commitments.

At the same time we know that grain is in the open air in some parts of the country, and since this is not acceptable, the grain should be brought to us, so that such mighty elevator capacities are loaded fully. The fact that we are working at half strength, with unplanned stoppages, creates additional difficulties with the supply of flour to the population.

[Reporter] The Vyazma Grain Products Combine is a key enterprise in the sector. It supplies high-grade flour, pasta, semolina for macaroni, and mixed feed to the northern regions of the country, as far as Murmansk. Recently a radical retooling took place here. Automation equipment controls the complex milling process. The labor-intensive loading and unloading operations have been mechanized. The modernization has made it possible to bring the milling production capacities up to 245 tonnes of grain a day, and 600 tonnes of mixed feed.

In August Stavropol Kray, the Kuban, and Rostov-na-Donu failed to deliver to Vyazma more than 100 railcars of grain. And the barriers to the flow of grain are created not by the transportation workers, but by the usual parochial strategists. First they fill their own elevators, even if this involves thousands of trucks waiting in line, and only after that will they fulfill contractual commitments. Nonetheless the elevators are accepting grain; these trucks mainly have Smolensk Oblast license plates.

Grain Harvest Yields Decline This Year

904B0291A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Commentary by N. Osychkin: "Each Hour Is Precious"]

[Text] This passionate call from the peasants is sounding out with increasing persistence at this crucial time in autumn. The harvest, grown at the cost of such enormous effort, is now in its final stage in many places, and the weather situation is complex. There is rain and it has grown cold, and the frosts are not far off. In order to save the grain, potatoes, vegetables, and other produce grown in our fields, the rural workers and the people from the countries must display real labor heroism and gather in the last kilogram of what has been grown in the fields and fully satisfy the population's demand for foodstuffs. Doing this means making a worthy contribution to perestroyka and to improving the well-being of the people.

What, then, has been done since the start of the harvesting, and during this last week? According to figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics, by 10 September grains and legumes (not counting corn) at kolkhozes and sovkhozes had been harvested from 70 million hectares. This is 69 percent of the areas sown but 25.9 million hectares less than for the corresponding period last year. Yield has declined, and has been 24.8 quintals per hectare across the country.

In recent days grain harvesting has been virtually completed at farms in Belorussia, Lithuania, the Kalmyk ASSR, oblasts in the central-Chernozem zone, Volgograd and Kaliningrad Oblasts in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], and Taldy-Kurgan Oblast in Kazakhstan. At the same time, in Tversk, Kostroma, Yaroslavl, Chelyabinsk, Irkutsk, Kustanay, Pavlodar, Turgay, and Tselinograd Oblasts and in Krasnoyarsk Kray less than half of areas sown to grain and legumes have been harvested.

Across the greater part of the European territory and the Urals, Siberia, and North Kazakhstan rain has been delaying the harvesting. At the same time, the bad weather has not everywhere been opposed with good organization and skill. This has reduced equipment productivity. During the last seven-day period the harvest has been gathered across 7.2 million hectares—1.4 million hectares less than during the previous seven-day period.

During the past week the grain output has been 15.3 quintals per hectare; in the RSFSR the figure was 16 quintals to the hectare, in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] 20.6, in Belorussia 23.2, and in the Kazakh SSR 13.5. We see that the low harvesting rates have also affected output. At many kolkhozes and sovkhozes grain losses have been permitted both on the fields and on the threshing floor, and so it is essential to tighten control over the quality of work, from the combine harvester to the threshing floor and the elevators.

The grain output figure for the entire country is 170 million tons—almost six million tons less than by this time in 1989. Taking into account loan paybacks, 48.7 million tons of grain—29 percent of output—has been passed to the state resources. Some 30.2 million tons of wheat have been purchased, including 18.6 million tons of high-quality wheat. Little strong or hard wheat has been procured. The state order for sales of grain to the state has been fulfilled only 56 percent up to now. Last week a total of 2.4 million tons of grain was delivered to the reception points—22 percent of output and 0.3 million tons less than during the previous week. In violation of existing procedure, in some places grain is being redrafted from state resources and handed over in exchange for mixed fodder by farms in Volgograd and Tomsk Oblasts and the Kalmyk ASSR.

The state order in the RSFSR has been filled 59 percent; in the Ukraine the figure is 79 percent; in Belorussia 94 percent; in Kazakhstan 23 percent; in Lithuania 76 percent; in Moldavia 32 percent; in Latvia 59 percent; and in Estonia 55 percent. In many places the commercial quality is poor. In Kirghizia, for example, it is eight percent, in Lithuania 10 percent, in Moldavia 12 percent. In the non-Chernozem zone in the RSFSR farms in Bryansk Oblast have fulfilled the state order 141 percent; in Orenburg Oblast the figure is 118 percent. And here in the adjacent oblasts of Tversk, Smolensk, and Kaluga the figures are 13 percent, 28 percent, and 43 percent.

Last week deliveries of grain to the elevators at farms in Ivanovo and Vladimir Oblasts virtually came to the halt, even though they have met only one-third of the state order. This year every opportunity exists for significantly adding to the country's grain reserves and to reserves at kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is important to complete the harvesting more quickly and better, program transport work efficiently, and enhance state discipline at all levels.

Other urgent field work also continues on the farms. Corn has been harvested from 9.7 million hectares—almost half the sown area—and vegetables from 334,000 hectares—one-third of the area sown. Flax has been cut from 308,000 hectares—57 percent of the area sown but 308,000 hectares less than last year. Work is proceeding only slowly to gather in potatoes; they have been harvested from only 17 percent of sown areas.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have procured 64.2 million tons of hay, 87.9 million tons of haylage, 125.4 million tons of silage, and three million tons of grass meal. There are 95.9 million tons of coarse and succulent fodder, expressed in feed units; this is 15 million tons less than by this date last year. This means that this work must be continued to make fodder resources adequate.

But how can field work be carried on without interruption if, as before, the situation remains strained with respect to the provision of fuel and lubricants to the republics of Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, Kazakhstan, and many oblasts of the RSFSR and the Ukraine? There are shortages of the 360,000 tons of gasoline, about 400,000 tons of diesel fuel, and 70,000 tons of diesel oils from annual stocks, needed to complete agricultural work. Because of the lack of spare parts, by early September kolkhozes and sovkhozes had more than 242,000 tractors, 156,000 trucks, 100,000 combine harvesters, and 34,700 ensilage harvesters and fodder harvesters, including 15,700 type KSK-100 and Ye-281 self-propelled machines, in a state of disrepair.

Rural workers are laying the foundation for the next harvest. Winter crops have been sown over 14.5 million hectares, against 20.4 million last year. Some 18.7 million hectares have been fall plowed—14.8 million less than by this date last year. We can see that there is much work to do in the autumn fields. We must not waste time and we must complete the harvesting without losses and create a firm foundation for the new harvest; this is today's urgent task!

Cotton Farm Goes Cooperative, Doubles Yield

PM1209135990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 11 Sep 90

[Report by M. Ganiyev and S. Ziyamukhamedov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] This kolkhoz [collective farm] has now been turned into an association of cooperatives. All sections of the farm have been leased out. The mere abandonment of the old and ossified system has added up to 100 rubles to the peasants' pay packets. Yields per hectare are up to 1,250 [units unspecified]—this is almost double the average for the republic. There is no plan or state order on this farm. Under the contract the peasants are paid for the finished job. That is why the leaseholders have no interest in inviting students, townspeople, or even their own schoolchildren to help out with the harvesting. That will be the case this season too. These combines may not be much to look at, but they garner the entire harvest. The cooperative members process the harvest at their own cotton gin, which is being completed here. The association comprises 22 cooperatives. Seven of them are service cooperatives. There are two firms: One to set up imported computer equipment, and the second to process quality output by regenerating cotton waste—this had never been done here before. The technology behind this is currently being kept secret. That is understandable—life, or rather the market, makes it a necessity. Many foreign firms are proposing joint ventures based on the association. The day we were filming here talks were under way with the South Korean "Khoin" [as heard] firm. All these are the advantages of the new economic relations in the countryside. But there are disadvantages too. Apparatchiks believe that many people will be left unemployed in Uzbekistan's densely populated villages.

[Madyarov] We are solving these problems on our farm by creating many new jobs—through the development of home-working cooperatives, for instance. Moreover, we are currently creating many small enterprises and cooperatives. We're doing a great deal to integrate the individual and public sectors. All forms of economic management should exist on kolkhozes. This is the only way to go about things—through different forms of economic management, through people, ensuring that they become masters of their own work and output. We can do all this. We must resolve these issues and break out of these vicious circles.

Autonomy Brings Kazakhstan Farm Success

PM1409141990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Report by A. Laptev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Having made a profit of three million rubles last year, East Kazakhstan's Leninskiy Sovkhoz [State Farm]—until recently a chronic loss-maker—is hoping, even in this season of undistinguished weather, to make no less than last year.

[Laptev] This is a field of sunflowers that earn foreign currency. They are the precursors, if you like, of market relations in this area. As you can see, the sunflowers are growing marvelously—they stand almost half as high again as a normal person. And the heads are almost half a meter in diameter. Unfortunately, they are taking their time to ripen at the moment because of the rain. And this is worrying everyone—from the director to the combine drivers. It should be said that the Leninskiy Sovkhoz now essentially embodies the principle of partnership—all for one, and one for all. The preparations for the new economic system and the transition to the market economy have rallied people and liberated them as individuals. Initiative has been given free rein and businesslike qualities have been revealed, as has the peasant's nose for business. It's not easy for the sovkhoz to make its millions in profit. They have to put in a great deal of work and think about how to find additional reliable sources of income. These include livestock units, beekeeping, and processing. Now everybody at the sovkhoz counts every hard-earned penny. But the main grain crop let them down this year. The weather's been bad, unfortunately. And now the fight is on for every ear of grain. I would add that this committed, businesslike, and, at the same time, extremely democratic atmosphere was the main factor that got the farm back on its feet.

[Makarus] A great part in bringing our farm back to profitability has been played by the autonomy we've been granted. Today we grow the crops that make the most profit. In the future we see our prospects—if the farm works normally, of course—as lying in our processing all our agricultural produce on site and selling processed rather than basic produce. For instance, in order to get over these problems we've concluded a contract with a Spanish firm to grow sunflowers and other agricultural crops on an industrial scale using Spanish technology, and to sell that produce to Spanish firms. We are planning to use the hard currency to buy equipment for processing meat, dairy products, and grain crops over the next year or two.

Scientific

Cleanup Under Way After Beryllium Plant Accident

PM1709204190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by V. Mirolevich: "Five Days After the Explosion"]

[Text] Ust-Kamenogorsk—According to figures provided by air and soil analysts, the situation in Ust-Kamenogorsk has returned to normal following the explosion at a beryllium production facility. But the problem of washing the city around the clock is just as acute.

Three days ago a small increase in the maximum permissible concentration of beryllium was detected in areas which, according to all the figures, could not have been reached by the poison cloud that formed following the explosion. The only conclusion is that the beryllium threat is being carried around the city by transportation. The only way to prevent the chemical taking to the air again is to keep the streets, sidewalks, and yards constantly wet.

Regrettably, the measures to clean the city are naturally causing pollution of the rivers—the Irtysh and the Ulba. Ecologists from the Nature Conservancy Committee are stressing that this must be approached conscientiously, since there is no other choice. However, there is virtually no way to organize large-scale cleaning of the city: The municipal services and enterprises have only a handful of the special vehicles required. It turns out that Ust-Kamenogorsk is supplied with them on the same basis as other cities. And this despite the fact that—bearing in mind the constant pollution of the city by discharges from the nonferrous metallurgy and Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry enterprises located in the center—the sanitation and epidemiology services at all levels issued an order several years ago prohibiting the territory from being cleansed using dry methods. The streets are supposed to be washed four times a day. The current situation is further complicated by the fact that the fuel quota for the special vehicles has been cut by the republic's Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services to a level that makes it impossible to carry out the task even once a day.

One other "poisonous" factor was revealed at Sunday's emergency commission session—a lack of glasnost. The previous day the commission had drawn up a detailed report for the population on the situation in the city, the measures being taken, and what each citizen should do in the circumstances. However, the leaders of the oblast televison and radio committee refused point-blank to give it air time, stating that they had received no authorization from the oblast leadership and that there was no need to get people excited since they know everything anyway. Yet even on the fifth day after the accident the city was mainly guided by rumors. The two broadcasts carried on local television were aimed at one thing only—reassuring people and heading off any possible unrest. Moreover, the television gave out wrong information, claiming that there was no need to wash anything and that people did not need checkups. It was only on the afternoon of the 16th that the detailed information the population needed was given out on the radio following categorical demands from the emergency commission.

This episode of a ban on the truth is a typical continuation of the operation of the administrative-command system: A group of competent specialists with emergency powers believe that people urgently need information, but ideological leaders with a minimal grasp of the subject continue to give out that information in small doses. Unfortunately, this is by no means a unique example. The emergency commission will still have to accurately establish why the first announcement of the explosion by the civil defense headquarters was made almost three hours after the event—when the discharge had already densely covered the city.

Cargo Craft Separates From Mir Complex

LD1709144290 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—The unmanned Soviet cargo spacecraft Progress M-4 disembarked from the Mir space station at 16:43 [1243 GMT] Moscow time today.

During the joint flight of Mir and Progress M-4, cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov carried out all planned operations, including unloading, refuelling, oxygen recharging and potable water transferring.

The cosmonauts used Progress M-4 engines to correct the space station's trajectory.

The cargo spacecraft is planned to remain in space until Septemberr 20. During its independent flight, an experiment will be held to study artificial plasma formations. To this end, the cosmonauts installed experimental equipment on the docking unit of Progress M-4.

Manakov and Strekalov, who have been in space for almost seven weeks, began their working day today with medical experiments. They studied Manakov's blood circulation system during exercises on a bicycle ergometer.

They also continued an experiment on the Gallar installation to grow gallium arsenide semiconducting material, which was started on September 12.

The cosmonauts are feeling well.

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Supreme Council Convenes 18 Sep

LD1809100190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 18 September begins carrying live the 18 September session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius. Supreme Council President Vytautas Landsbergis and Deputy Aleksandras Abisalas are presiding.

At 0710 GMT Landsbergis states that the agenda has been distributed among the deputies. He appeals to the deputies to speak in a constructive manner and discuss only those matters that are really important.

At 0717 GMT brief debates take place on the proposed agenda, which is not read aloud. Deputy Abisalas describes some items in the proposed agenda for next Thursday and Friday.

At 0724 GMT the agenda is adopted by a majority vote.

At 0726 GMT Deputy Gediminas [surname indistinct] submits a draft schedule of work to be carried out by the second session of the Supreme Council. Debates on this draft schedule take place.

At 0755 GMT voting takes place on items to be included in the draft schedule.

At 0756 GMT Dr. Bobelis, chairman of the Chief Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, VLIKAS, is on the rostrum. This committee is operating abroad, mainly in the United States. Dr. Bobelis describes the work of the committee abroad and its endeavors to help occupied Lithuania. He expresses his confidence that Lithuania will ultimately be victorious and will achieve genuine independence, but Lithuania should be united in its efforts in view of the present world political situation, which is changing not necessarily in Lithuania's favor.

At 0817 GMT the VLIKAS chairman in Argentina, (Arturas Miciunas), speaks. He briefly conveys greetings to the Supreme Council from the Argentinian Lithuanians.

At 0820 GMT Deputy Vagnorius presents a draft temporary law on measures to stabilize the Republic of Lithuania's market.

At 0841 GMT the session recesses until (?0915) GMT.

Pro-Union Lithuanian Party Approves Program

LD1509211890 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius September 15 TASS—The third, final stage of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress opened in Vilnius today to discuss and approve the programme of this pro-Union organisation.

The Congress is being attended by 642 delegates from the 45,000-strong republican organisation.

In his opening address at the Congress, Lithuanian Communist Party Chief Nikolas Burokiavicius, who is also Politburo member of the Soviet National Communist Party Central Committee, described the present political situation in the republic as "complicated and contradictory". According to Burokiavicius, the Lithuanian leadership "does everything to hamper the conclusion of a Union treaty between the centre and Lithuania, deliberately delaying talks with the Central Soviet Government".

One of the basic tasks now facing Communists in the republic consists in pressuring the republican leadership through the masses to demand that the Union treaty be signed the soonest possible and negotiations should then begin straight after.

Juozas Jermlavicius, a sector head of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, told the Congress about the new programme of the Communist Party of Lithuania submitted for the consideration by the Congress.

He noted, among other things, that during the discussion of their programme, Lithuanian Communists were unanimous in favouring socialist statehood, territorial integrity and the republic's genuine independence.

They believe that the only way towards these goals and towards securing their guarantees is through the establishment of a free union of sovereign socialist states, through the signing of a new Union treaty, he said.

Second Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Vladislav Shved spoke about the draft rules of the pro-Union Communist Party.

These basic documents were unanimously approved after the discussion and the introduction of amendments.

The Congress also approved the resolution "on the agrarian policy of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU)." The resolution said among other things that the Congress was "against forceful privatisation of agriculture proposed by the Republican Parliament and believes that the nature and scope of agrarian transformations should be determined by a peasant refernedum, taking into account the present state of land use in Lithuania".

The Congress adopted resolutions on Lithuania's statehood, the economic situation in the republic, the Communist Party's stance with regard to trade union and the younger generation, on the party policy in the field of culture, science and education.

Delegates to the Congress favoured more extensive information for the public on the situation in the republic. The Congress stated that the depoliticisation slogan was used in some places to oust communists from enterprises and offices.

The first day of the third stage in the 21st Congress of the Lithuanian (pro-Union) Communist Party was attended and addressed by Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary and Politburo Member Oleg Shenin.

Lithuanian Leaders Respond to Politburo Appeal

LD1709171990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] A recent appeal from the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to the Communists and people of Lithuania has evoked a great response from the republic's population. A TASS correspondent reveals two points of view: The Lithuanian leadership has responded immediately. Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Landsbergis, speaking on television the day of the appeal, expressed the opinion that the Kremlin leaders have thought of ways to prevent talks or postpone their start for the longest possible time. The Supreme Council chairman also spoke about a third party for the talks. He hinted at events taking place in eastern Lithuania.

In the opinion of Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, the tone of the Politburo appeal is benevolent toward the Lithuanian people. It is directed at the fundamental renewal of the working people's life, based on the law and democratic principles. The only way to do this is to conclude the Union treaty, not by Lithuania's secession from the USSR. He says Landsbergis' statement is not accidental. First, it is aimed at raising the seriously undermined authority of the republic's Supreme Council. Second, it is directed at whipping up interethnic passions. Third, one can clearly see in it a call for confrontation with the USSR leadership. In a political sense, Landsbergis' statement is adventuristic, thinks the leader of the Lithuanian Communists. It shows once again that the Lithuanian leadership is deliberately heading toward the disruption of talks with the USSR and that it is against the conclusion of the Union treaty. Burokevicius thinks that the working people of Lithuania, not Landsbergis, will have the last say on these issues.

Kaitseliit 'Provocative' Acts Called 'Training'

PM1709134690 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Colonel A. Yurkin under the rubric "Direct Line": "Who Approved the Provocation?"]

[Text] Tallinn, 11 Sep—The Estonia Committee Presidium has issued a statement on the incident on the border between Estonia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, saying that the provocative actions of Kaitseliit [Estonian Defense Union] were nothing more than training exercises by the defense union staff. The statement stresses that, like all citizens of the Estonian Republic, Kaitseliit members can move freely around the republic. According to the Estonia Committee, allegations that the defense union exercises were provocative cannot be taken seriously.

At the same time, Estonia wants to prevent the fall troop exercises that are traditionally held in the Baltic Military District to review the summer combat training. Tiit Madisson, second-in-command in the National Independence Party and renowned for his views, has openly said that the center of gravity of all work is going to shift toward the "occupying" troops.

Without any doubt, the nationalists will try to play on the republic's economic difficulties as well: Another jump in prices for a number of consumer groups is expected here. Food is going to become more expensive. The cost of services will also increase, which will hit the families of military servicemen, among others.

'Provacations' Within Law

PM1409134990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Colonel A. Yurkin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "'Lawlessness' Within Framework of Law"]

[Text] Tallinn—An embarrassing thing has happened at the republic Supreme Soviet session taking place in Tallinn. People's Deputy V. Malkovskiy proposed making a political assessment of the actions of "Kaitseliit" in holding provocative exercises on the territory of the sovereign Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Speaker J. Nugis turned down the proposal. The next speaker—M. Laar, member of the group of Christian Democrats in parliament—rejected the accusations against this paramilitary nationalist organization and reminded the deputies that they had adopted the law on symbols, which includes a point on Estonia's integrity within the 1940 borders. In adopting the law hardly any of those who voted thought that this document would give gave the go-ahead for provocations to seize territories.

The embarrassment was compounded by a sensational report in the Tartu newspaper EDAZI, which is close to all kinds of paramilitary nationalist formations. It revealed a secret: The defense minister of the bourgeois government in exile has conferred the military rank of colonel on K. Eller, the leader of "Kaitseliit." So is it a chance coincidence: the promotion and the provocation? At any rate, parliamentarians can be in no doubt that the leader of the assault detachments will not remain indebted. He is now forming subunits of volunteers "to defend the Arabian Peninsula," and it cannot be ruled out that tomorrow he will once again lead his "regiments" onto Russia's lands. At the same time... without violating the laws of present-day Estonia.

USSR, Estonian Supreme Soviets Discuss Ties

LD1409112890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Sep (TASS)—Consultations between groups of experts of the USSR and Estonian Supreme Soviets continued in Moscow today. The groups were led by Nikolay Gritsenko, chairman of the Commission for Social Protection, Labor, Wages, Prices, and Taxation of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Soviet of the Union and Indrek Toome, chairman of the commission on international ties of Estonia's Supreme Soviet.

Participants in the meeting discussed state, legislative, and economic aspects of relations between the USSR and Estonia from 1940 to 1990. In the course of the discussions definite rapprochement on the positions of both sides has taken shape.

Estonian representative Klara Khallik, member of the Commission for Nationalities Policy and Relations Between Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, thinks that "both sides have taken considerable steps toward mutual understanding.

Consultations between the groups of experts will continue.

Latvian Independent Communists To Change Name

LD1509223390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga, 15 Sep— At the Second Congress of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia, which opened today, the delegates are discussing, among other matters, the question of changing the name of the party.

The Independent Communist Party of Latvia was founded exactly five months ago after the split in the republican party organization. The parting of the ways took place, at the 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party, after a majority of the delegates spoke against the inclusion in the program documents of clauses on conferring upon the party the status of a fully independent organization, declaring its aim as the creation of an independent Latvian state and rejecting the idea of communism as utopian.

If 579 delegates represented 32,000 supporters of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia at the first congress in April, about 500 delegates represent 21,000 party members at the second congress. At the start of the year the single Communist Party of Latvia numbered 177,000 people.

Representatives of many of the republic's political parties and public and political organizations, including the Communist Party of Latvia, were invited to the congress.

Karlis Podnieks, a member of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia, for example, believes that "the Party platform and the fundamental principles of its activities are social-democratic." True, certain members of the party claim that "we need to move still further to the right," by rejecting the principles of the priority of social guarantees.

The argument at the congress now centers primarily upon the two options for the party's name; the Democratic Party of Latvia [Demokraticheskaya Partiya Latvii] or the Latvian Democratic Labor Party [Demokratischeskaya Partiya Truda Latvii]. And while the delegates are weighing up all the pros and cons the hosts and their guests organized a press conference for journalists in the break between sittings.

Taking part were Ivars Kezbes, chairman of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia, Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania, Harri Roots, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, Igor Chubays, a member of the coordinating council of the "Democratic Platform," and USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Afanasyev.

The press conference primarily discussed the situation in the country. According to Igor Chubays the "Democratic Platform" should dissociate itself organizationally from the CPSU in November. "We will hold an inaugural congress and create a new political party which will be close to a social democratic party of Russia," he said.

Answering a question about the draft of the new Union treaty, Yuriy Afanasyev, claimed in particular that "the Soviet Union no longer exists as a single state." The future of the Union republics should, in his opinion, be thought about "from that point of view." He called for the unification of the country's democratic forces. Such a union is, in his words, "topical."

The delegates plan to finish work late this evening.

Renamed Democratic Labor Party

LD1509223990 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 15 Sep 90

[By TASS Correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga September 15 TASS—Delegates to the Second Congress of the Latvian Independent Communist Party voted by a majority to change their party's name. It will henceforth be called the Democratic Labour Party of Latvia.

According to preliminary data, the party's leader, USSR People's Deputy Ivars Kezbers, will remain at the helm of the newly-named party as its chairman.

RSFSR

14 Sep RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session Carried

LD1409203890

Moscow Television Service in Russian continus its recorded report on the 14 September session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1904 GMT Deputy (Maley) says that he is in favor of his taxes being used to restore churches rather than in foreign policy ventures.

At 1906 GMT Deputy Abdulatipov comes to the microphone and talks of the problems caused by the repression of Islam in Muslim areas. He was educated at Dagestan University historical faculty, but was never able to study Dagestan prerevolutionary history because everything was written in Arabic. This law should unite people of different faiths. He is in favor of the law being adopted.

At 1909 GMT Deputy (Udalenko) comes to the microphone and talks of the good points of this law. Our society considers itself to be a law-governed state and therefore we must take into account both believers and nonbelievers. He says that buildings taken from the church do not need to be returned or compensation paid—the debt should simply be acknowledged. He is in favor of the law being adopted.

At 1912 GMT Deputy Tchaikovskiy comes to the microphone and says that the church must be supported. It plays a positive role in society.

At 1914 GMT Deputy Zaytsev comes to the microphone and says the law should be called the law on conscience and worship. He talks of the restoration of such church holidays as Christmas and Easter. He proposes the elimination of the 2 May and 8 November holidays.

At 1916 GMT Deputy (Dzhamudinov) speaks at the microphone.

At 1917 GMT Deputy (Astafyev) comes to the microphone and talks of the problems of teaching religion in areas of mixed religions.

At 1919 GMT Deputy (Zhigulin) is not against the law but notes that there are many religions and says that Article 13 should be excluded.

At 1921 GMT Deputy Lazarev says that he was in favor of freedom of conscience in his election manifesto. The law provides for equality of rights and responsibility before the law. No public organization or religion must have priviliges over others. He is in favor of the law with certain reservations. He is against the interference of the church in education. Religion should not interfere in the workings of the state.

At 1924 GMT Deputy Polosin returns to the microphone and says that in some respects religious associations have something in common with other public associations, while also differing. Therefore religious associations must be governed by different laws. Article seven allows for the practice of a citizen's religious belief in such places as hospitals, the Armed Forces, prison, etc. Many cases have come to court of people refusing to serve in the Army or carry weapons—there is a need for alternative service. This is provided for by the law. A recent meeting of representatives of the main religions on RSFSR territory approved the draft law. He thinks the law can be finally adopted tomorrow.

At 1931 GMT Yeltsin says that certain changes have been introduced to the resolution on the law. It is proposed to adopt the law on a first reading. If the law is not discussed tomorrow, then at the next session. A vote is taken and the resolution adopted.

At 1940 GMT the recorded report ends.

'Collapse' of Army Discussed at Supreme Soviet

LD1709224190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Interview with Aleksandr Alekseyevich Katenkov, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) joint subcommittee on defense, by Andrey Nikiforov at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session on 17 September—live or recorded]

[Text] [Nikiforov] Good day, esteemed listeners. Russia's deputies are working in the committees and commissions today. Among other important events such as the sitting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers of the republic and the two-day Soviet-Swedish seminar on multiparty systems that is now open, many deputies' attention has been gripped today by the roundtable on a wide range of issues regarding the republic's national security. The tone of the whole conversation was set by Colonel General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov, people's deputy, who outlined the new approaches to the concept of national security. Now in our studio is one of those taking part in the roundtable, Aleksandr Alekseyevich Katenkov. He is the deputy chairman of the joint subcommittee of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet on the defense of the state sovereignty of the republic and a lieutenant colonel in the Armed Forces.

Aleksandr Alekseyevich, please tell us about the discussion that is taking place at the roundtable at the moment.

[Katenkov] Good day, esteemed listeners. You have just heard the opinion of my colleagues from the USSR Supreme Soviet on the problems in transition to the market. In his views, he said that no doubt it is time for the government to use its power to put the program into effect. It is precisely this problem that worries the deputies of Russia at the moment, including those who are working on the problems of Russia's national security and the defense of its sovereignty. It is precisely this topic that today's roundtable discussed. In our profound conviction, no program, certainly not the 500 days program that we are to implement, can be effected without mechanisms ensuring that all the laws and decisons of the Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, and the Russian Government are implemented. We are already encountering mass sabotage of our decisions at the local level. This problem concerns us all.

The problem of protecting Russia's sovereignty is not restricted to adopting measures to implement the forthcoming 500 days program, however. This involves a very wide range of issues. Unfortunately, because of the lack of time, I cannot discuss them all. I want to dwell on a problem that is of concern to the majority of our republic and the country as a whole. This is the problem of defense and the Armed Forces. One of the aspects of the national security system naturally includes defense. We talked primarily about the fact that the Armed Forces, in their present state, are far from meeting the requirements on defense sufficiency. They have, to a great extent, lost their combat capability.

The most pressing matter, however, is the state—both the internal state and internal relations among servicemen—currently prevailing in the Armed Forces. I am not going to cite examples, as you are all well aware of them, but the situation in the country is now such, and attitudes toward the Armed Forces are such—precisely due to this aspect—that the Armed Forces are on the verge of collapse. It is no secret to any of you that the majority of the republics have already made the decision either to set up their own armed forces or not to send their young men to serve in the Army outside the republics. In the near future we could find ourselves facing the fact that Russia will be forced to bear the entire burden of the Union's defense by itself. It is my profound conviction, and also that of my colleagues, that there is no doubt that the Army should be an all-Union one. If we divide the Army according to republics, it will essentially mean the collapse of our Union and the collapse of our state.

[Nikiforov] It is another matter how that all-Union army will be constructed.

[Katenkov] That is what we have been discussing.

[Nikiforov] Dmityriy Antonvich said that each republic should be able to delegate functions to the Union army; that is, to take part in it. That is his idea.

[Katenkov] That is what we have been discussing. The Army cannot continue to exist in its present state, nor can it ensure the country's defense capability. However, the Union government and the leadership of the Ministry of Defense cannot and, I am afraid, does not want to embark upon radical reform or military reform, that of the Armed Forces included.

[Nikiforov] Does reform mean the professionalization of the Army, or are there other aspects?

[Katenkov] It includes this. There are a great many aspects. One of them is the professionalization of the Army. We are convinced that the professionalization of the Army will remove such aspects as internal tension within the Army itself and considerably increase its combat capability. In consultations with the representatives of other republics, we have reached the conclusion that this is a unanimous view. A professional and radically reformed Army would be to the liking of almost all republics.

[Nikiforov] Aleksandr Alekseyevich, it is said that a professional Army will cost the people more. Is this true?

[Katenkov] Not exactly. The point is that a professional Army should, of course, have far fewer numbers than the Army we have at present. We have calculated both troop officers and specialists at the militry institutes, including the economic institute, and the results show that a professional Army with considerably fewer numbers than at present will not cost the state any more than the Army we have now. In any event, its combat capability would be far higher and it would cause far less tension than the Army does now.

[Nikiforov] Aleksandr Alekseyevich, can I ask you about another issue that the deputies discussed today? This is the issue of withdrawing the Army from party control. For example, Dmitriy Antonovich said that if there are to be a great many parties and each one is to have its own structure within the Army, this would have a considerable impact on combat capability and would generally not be an acceptable situation. Party influence of any kind should therefore be removed from the Army.

[Katenkov] There is no doubt about this, nor can there be any question of any kind of party structures continuing to exist within the Army. Most unfortunately, the president's last decree on reforming the political bodies, which will introduce party structures into the Army as well as the political bodies, effectively subordinates the Armed Forces to just one party—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As a Communist, it pains me to speak of this, since it evokes a negative reaction from the majority of the population. Moreover, it will have a negative effect on the future combat capability of the Army. The Army should not be subordinate to any party. It should be subordinate only to the supreme authority of the country.

[Nikiforov] At the same time, it was said that state bodies, precisely state bodies, should exist. It was stressed that these will deal with social protection and the education of servicemen.

[Katenkov] Yes. I am often asked this question and I have long since definitively given my own opinion on political bodies. I don't know what they are going to be called or even if they are going to be called political bodies. It does not matter much to me. There are bodies in all the Armed Forces of all the countries in the world which deal with educational and cultural work, psychological analysis, and other tasks that can, in the end, be called political work. These bodies should belong to the state and should carry out state policies within the Army. They should not, I stress, follow the policies of a particular party. To end our conversation, I should like to say a few words about how I see, or how we see, the implementation of all these reforms. I have already said that the Union government and the Ministry of Defense are not rushing military reform. During the consultations with the representatives of other republics, we worked out an opinion whereby defense problems should be included in the Union treaty. This should stipulate the compulsory implementation of radical military reform. I think that without this condition the majority of republics will not agree to sign the Union treaty. I think this may be force, but all the same, by this pressure we must make the Union government embark upon a radical reform of the Army that will remove the majority of the problems within the Army and around it. I think the people will back such an idea.

[Nikiforov] Thank you, Aleksandr Alekseyevich Katenkov, for your detailed account of the discussions that took place at the roundtable on matters of national security and for your own point of view on all these issues. I now conclude my report from the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Trade Union Leader Seeks Government's Resignation

LD1709193590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Sep (TASS)—The main task of the Russian trade unions consists of defending the interests of the people of labor, ensuring social guarantees in conditions of the transition to the market economy, Igor Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia [FNPR], has declared.

Speaking here today at a news conference devoted to the second session of the Constituent Congress of Trade Unions of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], which opens on 18 September, he expressed the opinion that the FNPR should master all forms of struggle for the working people's rights, including strike or threat of strike. The chairman of the FNPR advocated the creation of strike funds at the level of oblast committees of the trade unions. Apart from that, the Russian trade unions intended to create an FNPR solidarity fund for assisting victims of natural and other disasters.

The chairman of the FNPR announced that according to preliminary calculations the independent trade unions of Russia have 54 million members. He said that apart from the elected delegates, representatives of 40 political parties and movements of the RSFSR have been invited to the second session of the constituent congress. Invitations have also been sent to Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Ivan Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR, from whom a reply has not yet been received.

Igor Klochkov advocated the resignation of the USSR Government, stressing that the present Union government has "marked time for too long", "made a mess of the market" and has "exhausted the credit of confidence" of the people.

Concerning relations with alternative trade union organizations, he said the FNPR does not claim the monopoly in Russia and normal relations should be established between the Russian trade unions and these new organizations.

The chairman of the FNPR announced that to publicize their ideas, the newspaper of the Russian trade unions, PROLOG, [PROLOGUE] which will go on sale tomorrow, has been instituted, along with the journal PROFSOYUZY I EKONOMIKA [TRADE UNIONS AND THE ECONOMY] which will be published beginning next year.

Silayev, Russian Unions Discuss '500 Days' Plan

904F0255A Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Sep 90 p 1

[Article by V. Pisarchik: "...But Not To Smooth Things Over Either"]

[Text] The full Russian Council of Ministers did not attend this unusual, one might say portentous, meeting. However, this was not because some of the ministers "look down" on the trade unions. The reason was that some heads of ministries have not been introduced to the Supreme Soviet of the republic and confirmed yet. However, all of the already "accomplished" ministers did attend the meeting of representatives of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] government and the Independent Trade Unions of Russia Council.

Thus, the proposal to hold "roundtable discussions" on the most significant issues of life in our country with the participation of the government and the trade unions, made by the Independent Trade Unions of Russia in the spring, is finally being implemented in reality. As Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers I. Silayev confirmed, such meetings will now become regular.

The meeting was opened by I. Klochkov, chairman of the Independent Trade Unions of Russia. He pointed out the aspects of concern to the trade unions and stressed that the task of the trade unions is to defend the interests of hired labor; at present, the Independent Trade Unions of Russia represents more than two-thirds of the working people of Russia. Certainly, discussing the concept of transition to a market economy in the republic became the main item on the agenda. On the previous day, a session of the Supreme Soviet of Russia supported the "500 days" program and gave the government one month to develop arrangements for its implementation. In conjunction with this, Commission Chairman G. Yavlinskiy, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, expressed his gratitude to the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] for preparing the draft Foundations of Employment Legislation which became a part of the package of laws envisaged by the program.

Perhaps, the trade union half of the participants in this meeting had less confidence in the 500 days concept than the Russian deputies on Tuesday. "Give us substantial guarantees"—this demand addressed to the government was found in the monologues of, to name just a few of the speakers, Yu. Makarov, chairman of the Murmansk Oblast Committee of Fishing Industry Employees; V. Tolmachev, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Petropavlovsk "Rybkholodflot" Facility from Kamchatka; and L. Yarkin, chairman of the Trade Union Committee of the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine...

G. Yavlinskiy responded to this approximately in this way: Since there are no "fathers of the people" anymore, there will not be personal assurances either. Joint, common efforts are the only guarantee. Prime Minister I. Silayev added: The government of Russia is prepared to do everything to emancipate the labor collectives and give them real independence. The authors of the program themselves do not conceal the fact that there are "blank spots" in their concept. However, the "blank spots" will not be eliminated unless practical steps are taken to implement the program.

For example, here is one of the problems. The government "side" unconditionally supported the obligation to determine the minimum subsistence income in the republic taking into account differences in the cost of living and structure of the population in individual regions, which was entered as point one in the draft Agreement Between the RSFSR Government and the Presidium of the Independent Trade Unions of Russia Council for 1991. However, is mathematics the only issue?

G. Yavlinskiy said that, according to his analysis, the minimum subsistence income on the average in the republic came to 105 rubles [R] in the spring and summer of last year, but it is R135 for a middle-aged single man residing in the central area of Russia. However, these numbers have not been officially discussed by anybody anywhere. Moreover, even the Law on Retirement Benefits, adopted relatively recently, was compiled on the R70 minimum subsistence income.

What is to be done now? Should R105, R135, or the amount which has probably increased still further in the last year become the basis? However, will there be enough funds to pay minimal wages at these levels? Most likely there will not. There are two ways out here: Either remain silent about this statistic or release it to the public, indicating a specific time when such minimal wages and retirement benefits will be possible.

G. Yavlinskiy warned: "Personally, I am in favor of telling the people everything honestly."

Let us help Grigoriy Alekseyevich: I believe that after this is published the mystery of manipulations with the subsistence minimum income will be revealed, even if just a little, at least to the readers of TRUD...

It is expected that the "500 days" program will be perfected before it begins and in the course of its implementation. I believe that it is important to note in this reference that Independent Trade Unions of Russia Chairman I. Klochkov and I. Silayev instructed their deputies right at the meeting to stay in touch permanently. Moreover, the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers suggested that Independent Trade Unions of Russia representatives take part in developing arrangements for the implementation of the program in a form which is acceptable to the trade unions.

Along with the concept of transition to a market economy, the progress of the execution of a program for eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station, the already mentioned draft agreement, and other urgent issues were discussed keenly at the meeting, which lasted four hours without a break. As a result of the meeting, both sides recognized the mutual usefulness of such contacts.

To complete my report, I would like to quote K. Doyev, chairman of the trade union group of RSFSR people's deputies and chairman of the North Ossetian Oblast Council of Trade Unions:

"What we should not do is smooth things over. Incidentally, the government of Russia asks that we extend to it a credit of confidence for carrying out its program. I believe that the signing of the agreement between the government and the trade unions may become a vote in a way."

As I see it, this is a very sensible consideration.

Silayev News Conference on '500 Days' Program

Program To Begin on 1 Oct

LD1709215790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Correspondent V. Stepanyuk video report on a news conference held by RSFSR Council of Ministers Chairman Ivan Silayev at the press center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 17 September, including recorded remarks by Silayev; the accompanying video shows Silayev speaking at the press conference; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Stepanyuk] At the outset of his press conference today, the Russian president described the program bearing the title "500 Days" as a relatively brief period during which the country's leadership still might obtain a mandate of the people's confidence, and during the course of which radical changes, paving the way to market relations and ensuring mutual improvements in both the economy and the lives of the people, are due to be carried out.

[Silayev] I am able to tell you that a RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium session was held today at which a date for the start of action, the start of events—1 October 1990—was endorsed.

[Stepanyuk] The purpose of the program, Comrade Silayev said, is to halt the negative processes in the shortest possible time, to stabilize the situation and, drawing upon the new economic doctrine, to move toward the market. During the first 100 days, commencing from October, it is proposed to introduce emergency measures providing for a vigorous policy of removal from the state sector and encouragement of free enterprise. In the opinion of the compilers of the program, a return of a substantial portion of ownership to the people will provide us with an opportunity to manage more effectively.

The chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers replied to questions connected with the new outlook on the rights of citizens to ownership and economic activity, freedom of the consumer market and fair prices, increases in incomes and social protection. Silayev also spoke in detail about the changes that are due to occur in the structures of Union and republican governments if the program is adopted. In particular, replying to a question about the resettlement of employees of ministries which are to be abolished, Ivan Stepanovich said:

[Silayev] Insofar as we shall also be saying that there will be unemployed once they are released, we have a definite program; measures will be taken in order to use the released personnel in other spheres of the national economy. This also concerns the apparatus of the ministries that are being eliminated.

[Stepanyuk] The recently created Information Department of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which organized the press conference, and its head, press attache of the Russian premier, the journalist Valentin Sergeyev, was concerned that all the Soviet and foreign correspondents who were present should receive these documents—The Concept and Program for the Transition to a Market Economy, and the draft bills required for its implementation.

Stresses 'Unity' in Reform Program

LD1709223990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic council of ministers, spoke today at a news conference held at the Foreign Ministry press center. He presented the concept of the program for the transition to the market relations, which is entitled "500 Days," to Soviet and foreign journalists. Here are some aspects of this program:

[Begin Silayev recording] The program which has been presented here was developed jointly with the Union republics. Practically all the Union republics, including Russia, have adopted their own programs, their own concepts of sovereignty, in a short period of time. Therefore, the first special feature is that the program presented to you represents a consolidation of the economic forces of all the Union republics. This is not the result of the efforts of a team of just one republic. This is the product of joint work of all the republics, except Estonia. We attach special importance to this aspect of the program presented here, that is, economic union, because the negative rather than positive processes which are taking place threaten the very fact of the USSR's existence, and certain steps in this direction have already been taken.

All the Union republics support the common all-Union market, the common currency, and all other measures that demand unity in implementation of the economic reform. This approach enables us to act in harmony. And this has been embedded in the program. Because this will be a union of the sovereign states, the main authority—legal, organizational, administrative—is correspondingly transfered into the hands of the Union republics. Only those functions that will not be possible or profitable to implement independently by each of the republics will be delegated to the central authorities.

Our opponents—supporters of the moderately radical program—base their moderation on the assumption of the crisis situation in the economy and society as a whole. Basing ourselves exactly on these same situations we support decisive and radical actions in our program. The name of this program—"500 Days"—reflects all this. We realize what we are undertaking, for we have already too little time at our disposal; our society can wait no longer. We are not giving some hazy promises for some indefinite future to our people, to our society, but offer a program for joint actions—I stress—for joint actions in the shortest time possible, in order to initially stop the negative processes which are taking place, to stabilize them, and then, at an appropriate stage, to achieve the beginning of the positive processes. [end recording]

Denies Claims of 'Shock Therapy'

LD1709150690 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow September 17 TASS—"The programme of transition to market economy, elaborated by Academician Stanislav Shatalin's team, is based on the economic union of Soviet republics," chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Ivan Silayev told a press conference here today, devoted to the concept and programme of Russian economy's transfer to market relations.

Shatalin's programme was approved by Russia's parliament and is known as the "500 days plan".

According to Silayev, negative processes prevail over positive ones in the country's economy. This, in his opinion, "Jeopardizes the very existence of the USSR." "In the light of this, the participation of all the union republics, except Estonia, in the drafting of the 500 days programme serves to consolidate society's economic forces," he said.

Silayev revealed that today's meeting of the Presidium of Russia's Supreme Soviet had reaffirmed that the implementation of the 500 days programme would be started on October 1st.

Russia's premier denied the claims of the programme's opponents that the document is "excessively leftist" and that it is a "shock therapy" plan. "We realise what we are doing," he said. "We have too little time left and society can wait no longer. We are offering not vague, illusory promises, but a programme of quick joint actions".

"The Shatalin team's programme has a 'federal slant'. It is not a purely republican document," Silayev noted. He recalled that the First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, which proclaimed the sovereignty of the Russian Federation, went on record for a single Union of Soviet Republics. "These are the principles on which the 500-day programme is based," he noted.

Silayev expressed the conviction that the republican and federal parliaments would adopt Shatalin's programme or the variant proposed by Academician Abel Aganbegyan, which is "98 per cent" based on the provisions of the 500 days programme.

The prime minister stressed his adherence to the idea of private ownership of land, but opposed "global privatisation".

Turning to President Gorbachev's proposal to hold a referendum on the transfer of land to private ownership and the idea of Soviet Deputy Premier Academician Leonid Abalkin to call an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, Silayev said these acts were "undesirable" for the programme's realisation. But if these proposals are approved by other union republics, he said, Russia will have to act according to its 500 days programme, approved by the republic's parliament.

Expressing his view on the demonstration in support of the 500 days programme, which was held in the centre of Moscow yesterday, Silayev noted: "It was a reflection of the aggravating situation and a demand to improve the situation radically." He called for political stability in the country, which is necessary to carry out the economic programme.

Leningrad, Estonia Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD1409203290 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Text] Leningrad September 14 TASS—The Estonian government and the Leningrad city and regional council of people's deputies signed a general agreement here today to develop broad-scale political, economic, social, cultural and legal cooperation between this Soviet Baltic republic and the second largest city in the Soviet Union.

They intend to maintain direct economic and other ties and to establish an Estonian cultural centre in Leningrad and a Leningrad cultural centre in Estonia.

During the discussion of the draft agreement on Thursday, the sides decided to work out and adopt a bilateral agreement on the status of the economic border between the Leningrad region and Estonia.

According to the sides, this will enable them to protect the mutual interests of their consumer markets, block the channels of profiteering and help bilateral economic normalization.

Leningrad Rally Calls for Restoration of Name

PM1709134290 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Captain First Rank A. Zlydnev under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Forward or Backward?.."]

[Text] Leningrad, 11 Sep—Several thousand people gathered in Leningrad's Palace Square last Sunday [9 September] for a rally sanctioned by the Leningrad Soviet that was "dedicated to the renaming of the city and the restoration of its former name—Saint Petersburg." The organizers of this noisy event included the historical-patriotic association "Russian Banner," the Christian Democratic Union, the national-democratic society "Free Russia," and the Petersburg Monarchist Center.

As was to be expected, most of the speeches were clearly anticommunist and anti-Leninist. There were also the inevitable insulting attacks on the CPSU and the leadership of the Soviet state. One speaker tried to prove "the need to liberate the city from fascist-communist occupation," another spoke out in favour of "consolidating democratic forces, dismantling party structures, and making a public display of handing in party membership cards," while a third called for the closure of the V.I. Lenin Museum, the dismantling of all monuments connected with his name, and the renaming of streets bearing the names of revolutionaries. Moreover, it was proposed that all this should be paid for out of CPSU funds.

The rally adopted a resolution demanding that the Leningrad Soviet take the decision to "restore the historical name of our city"; it also announced the formation of the citizens' "Saint Petersburg Committee" as a body to monitor any action taken by Leningrad Soviet deputies on this matter.

We seem to be getting used to noisy marches, pickets, and rallies. Perestroyka has made it possible for people to express their opinions and defend them in sharp debate, but, you must agree, it hurts to have to see and realize that there are forces calling over and over for everything to be razed to the ground.

Dzerzhinsk Mayor's Post Abolished

PM1709134590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Anatoliy Yershov: "Post of Mayor Abolished; City Soviet Session Has Decided to Abolish Post of Gorispolkom Chairman"]

[Text] Dzerzhinsk—"The need to make changes to the management structure has long been urgent," says B. Kryzhkov, chairman of the Dzerzhinsk City Soviet and a USSR people's deputy. "With time our deputies are acquiring increasing professional experience and skills and are trying to thoroughly resolve problems of the city's life. Of the 16 standing commissions seven are now headed by deputies released from their main work. Unfortunately, from the outset some gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] workers tried to set themselves against the new authorities. Sometimes matters almost came to open conflicts. In brief, practice has shown the perniciousness of dividing power into legislative and executive power on the basis of a city of medium size like Dzerzhinsk. Incidentally, as a result of this the inhabitants of Dzerzhinsk felt quite soon that supplies had deteriorated in the city and in particular that stocks of butter, meat, and other foods had been reduced. The labor collectives rightly began to get angry at this situation. It must be said that in this situation Vladimir Karlovich Kromberg, chairman of the gorispolkom, was not always up to the mark. He has economic skill and he is persistent, often preferring tough individual measures, which also played its part in the antagonism between the soviet and the executive committee. Unfortunately under existing legislation the executive committee is accountable only to the session....

Henceforth a new post has been introduced in the city soviet—that of deputy chairman for the city's economic development. After an all-around discussion Deputy V. Kromberg was elected to this post. As we can see, the deputies by no means deemed the former mayor unsuited to leading work. Nor in this case is it a question of the usual cadres reshuffling. The chemical workers' city with a population of almost 300,000 needs a united, form master, which the local soviet is designed to become.

Vladimir Oblast Journalists Call Off Strike

PM1709145290 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent L. Gladysheva under the rubric "Following the Situation": "Strike Called Off"]

[Text] Vladimir—The day before a warning strike by journalists in Vladimir Oblast was due to begin, the strike committee decided to call off the action. The fact is that the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] has urgently considered the journalists' demands and complied with some of them. The 150,000 rubles needed to introduce new wages for city and rayon newspaper journalists has been found in the budget.

It seems that a resolution on this was adopted by the USSR State Committee for Labour and Social Problems and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions on 28 July this year, but people at local level have been in no hurry to implement it. Those most familiar with the problems of the press—the oblast party committee ideology department and the oblast administration of publishing houses, printing plants, and the book trade—have not troubled themselves to ensure that the resolution is implemented at local level. Who, if not they, should be most concerned with the needs and problems of press workers?

The oblispolkom has also decided that retail prices for local newspapers in cities and rayons must reflect real expenditure on them. Some industrial enterprises are prepared to help their newspapers and act as sponsors. There is also the real support of their subscribers.

It has been decided that some of the profit from advertising should be used—at editorial discretion—to increase journalists' wages. One cannot help wondering: Was it really necessary to wait until there were warnings of strike action, when everything should have been solved legally before? As events have shown, it is simply that people have been in no hurry to implement the decision adopted by the government.

Yet to be decided, however, are the terms for improving the wages of journalists working for the bigger newspapers, whose relative prosperity also depends on the above resolution with a market economy approaching.

Fuel Shortages Disrupt Far North Airline Flights

PM1709111290 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[A. Timoshenko report under the "Alarm Signal" rubric: "Reindeer Travel Is Great, But Aircraft Are...Worse"]

[Text] Arkhangelsk Oblast—Even people who have never visited the Far North know that aircraft are the only—the most reliable—means of transport in these areas. I admit that that is what I too would have thought were it not for my tour of duty there....

The territory of Mezenskiy Rayon in Arkhangelsk Oblast totals more than 230,000 square km. Naturally the rayon center cannot do without an airport. Nimble "An's" fly out from there to the remote, inaccessible villages of Dolgoshchelye, Ruchi, and Koyda....

However, a difficult situation has now developed on the local airlines: 10,000 potential passengers have not made their journeys. Another equally sad reality is that delivery of economic freight for the winter period is being held up. There is very little time left—the weather looks as though it will deteriorate.

The fuel shortage is the reason for the current situation. It has now become customary for aircraft to fly from Mezen to Arkhangelsk, get their fuel supplies, and return to Mezen. Passengers are having to wait for a flight for three or four days.

Western Republics

Belorussia, Lithuania Sign Economic Protocol

LD1709124990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] A direct link of economic cooperation has been established by Belorussia and Lithuania. In Minsk they signed a protocol on their intention to cooperate in various spheres. As noted during the meeting of these republics', delegations there are no fundamental disagreements between them. By 25 September it is planned to conclude the work completely and take the draft treaty [dogovor] between the republics to the heads of government for signing.

Moldavia Issues Decrees Against Gagauz Movement

Calls Congress 'Unconstitutional'

90UN2795B Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 22 Aug 90 p 1,3

["Decree of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium: On the Rulings of the 'First Congress' of People's Deputies of all Levels From Territories Densely Populated by the Gagauz"]

[Text] The SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium notes that the rulings of the special congresses of Gagauz on 12 November and 3 December 1989 and 22 July 1990 were repealed as contradicting the constitutional legislation of the USSR and the SSR of Moldova and, as a result, do not have legal force and consequences. In addition, on 27 July 1990 the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet adopted a ruling on the Gagauz question with regard to the results of specially conducted scientific investigations.

On the day it completed its first session, the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet declared a moratorium on conducting any social and political actions (rallies, processions, referendums, congresses, etc.) leading to the destabilization of the social and political situation in the republic. The parliament, its standing committees, and the presidium carried out a great explanatory campaign among the population of the southern rayons, and on 18 August 1990 the leadership of the republic appealed to deputies of the local Soviets of People's Deputies and to all the citizens of the southern rayons of the SSR of Moldova to refrain from participation in preparations for the deliberately anticonstitutional congress and not to tolerate aggravation of a social and political situation in the republic that is already extremely explosive.

However, despite the measures that had been undertaken, on 19 August 1990 in the city of Komrat a large number of people's deputies of all levels (more than 700 people) from territories densely populated by the Gagauz gathered at a congress of deputies of the so-called Gagauz Republic. Leaders of the "Gagauz Independence Movement" and several people's deputies who are leaders of the local Soviets of People's Deputies prepared and conducted the congress.

The congress adopted a number of illegal rulings. Their essence is:

—To repeal decrees of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet and its Presidium concerning rulings of the first and second congresses of representatives of the Gagauz on 12 November and 3 December 1989 and 22 July 1990 which announced the formation of a Gagauz ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and of provisional organs of state power and administration for it and stated that the rulings of the aforementioned congresses are binding over the entire territory densely populated by the Gagauz and over the future Gagauz Republic;

—To consider antidemocratic and antiscientific the conclusion of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet standing commissions on questions of nationalities, local self-government, and local management with regard to the activities of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium commission which studied the requests of several USSR people's deputies and other appeals concerning the formation of a Gagauz autonomy within the SSR of Moldova, and to consider as not having legal force on the territory of the Gagauz Republic the decree of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet on this issue;

—To insist that the Gagauz have a right to the territory of Budzhak inasmuch as they say they are the indigenous residents of that region;

—To determine the borders of the Gagauz Republic, which encompass the territory of Vulkeneshtskiy, Komratskiy, and Chadyr- Lungskiy Rayons;

—To claim that the Gagauz consider themselves free from any political or legal obligations with regard to the SSR of Moldova inasmuch as the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet acknowledged the fact of the formation of the Moldavian SSR on 2 August 1940 to be illegal;

—To claim that the Gagauz have the right to form their own national-state formation in a form chosen by them;

—To claim that provisional organs of state power and administration formed by the Gagauz on the territory densely populated by them have the right to participate as an independent entity in the process of developing and concluding a Union treaty;

—To form a Central Electoral Commission by 22 August 1990 for elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Gagauz Republic;

—To designate elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Gagauz Republic for 28 October 1990;

—And to develop a mechanism for the independent functioning of the economy of the Gagauz Republic with its own financial and banking system, and to declare its territory a free economic zone.

Basing themselves on illegal rulings, the congress participants announced in the Declaration "On the Freedom and Independence of the Gagauz People from the Republic of Moldova":

—"the full freedom and independence of the Gagauz people from the state power and administration of the Republic of Moldova,"

—the firm intention of the Gagauz "to begin building our own legal state formation in the form of an independent republic,"

—that "citizens of Gagauz nationality retain USSR citizenship and are not citizens of the SSR of Moldova,"

—that laws, decrees, and other acts and rulings of the supreme organs of state power and administration of the SSR of Moldova may be applied to the territory densely populated by the Gagauz so long as they do not contradict the interests of the latter and only until the appropriate acts of the Gagauz Republic have been developed, adopted, and implemented.

The content and character of the rulings adopted by the congress testify to their clearly anticonstitutional orientation, to the political and legal ignorance of their authors as well as of those who inspired and organized the congress, and to the misrepresentation of historical truth. These rulings are directed at a forcible alteration of the state structure of the SSR of Moldova and a forcible violation of the unity of its territory under the guise of democratism and parliamentarianism; they do not take into consideration the rulings of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet as the supreme organ of state power, and they deliberately set the vital interests of the Gagauz against the interests of the majority of the republic's population.

Acknowledging the inadmissibility of allowing politically irresponsible officials to continue such a dangerous political game, and acknowledging the need to put the social and political situation in order and to ensure normal conditions for the functioning of constitutional organs of power and administration at the local level, the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium, guided by paragraph 15 of Article 105 of the SSR of Moldova Constitution (Basic Law), decrees:

1. To consider the so-called first congress of people's deputies of all levels from the territories densely populated by the Gagauz conducted on 19 August 1990 in Komrat an anticonstitutional organ, and to consider the rulings adopted by it as contradicting the Constitution (Basic Law) of the SSR of Moldova and not entailing any legal consequences.

2. For the local Soviets of People's Deputies of population centers densely populated by the Gagauz not to implement the rulings of the aforementioned congress and to strictly observe the Constitution and other laws of the Moldavian SSR. Implementation of the rulings of the indicated congress will be viewed as opposition to the execution of the requirements of the Constitution of the SSR of Moldova and other laws of the SSR of Moldova and will entail the appropriate legal consequences.

3. For the government of the SSR of Moldova to study the question of the correspondence of the activities of the "Gagauz Independence Movement" to its statutes and to the existing legislation of the SSR of Moldova, to determine the advisability of the continuation of its activities, and to inform the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium about this by 1 September 1990.

4. To charge the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the SSR of Moldova (Comrade I.G. Kostash), the KGB of the SSR of Moldova (Comrade F.L. Botnar), and the Procuracy of the SSR of Moldova (Comrade D.Kh. Postovan) with carrying out a careful examination of the circumstances surrounding the preparations for and conduct of the aforementioned congress, to establish its organizers, to decide the question of bringing action against them in accordance with the requirements of existing legislation of the republic, and to inform the presidium about this within a month.

5. To warn the leaders of the "Gagauz Independence Movement" and the leaders and deputies of the local Soviets of People's Deputies from territories densely populated by the Gagauz that in the event of the continuation of anticonstitutional activities directed at undermining the foundations of the state and social structure of the republic, the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium will take all the measures stipulated by law to bar similar and other illegal activities.

Responsibility for possible undesirable consequences of the measures taken to ensure legality and law and order on the aforementioned territories will be borne by leaders of the "Gagauz Independence Movement" and leaders and deputies of the appropriate Soviets of People's Deputies who are pursuing the idea of the forcible dismemberment of the republic, provoking the Gagauz population to actions that contradict its interests and rights, and urging people on to interethnic clashes.

6. For the mass media to objectively and thoroughly report the results of the first congress of people's deputies from the territory densely populated by the Gagauz, devoting special attention to the destructive and antistate nature of the rulings it has adopted and to the consciously illegal activities of the extremist-minded leaders of the "Gagauz Independence Movement" and of a number of people's deputies who are leaders of the corresponding Soviets of People's Deputies.

7. To entrust verification of the execution of the present decree to the Department for Questions of Legislation and Law and Order of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Secretariat. * * *

The SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium summons the Gagauz population to reason and asks the Gagauz not to give in to the politically irresponsible appeals of persons who do not respect either the past or the future of their own people and are prepared to provoke them to the commission of an irreparable, historic mistake.

Calls for Movement's Disbandment

90UN2802A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 23 Aug 90 p 1

["Decree of the Government of the SSR of Moldova on the Disbandment of the People's Movement 'Gagauz Khalky'"]

[Text] With regard to the fact that, by its actions, the People's Movement "Gagauz Khalky" [Gagauz Independence Movement] deviates from the goals, tasks, and means of achieving them defined by its rules; that it shows disrespect for the demands of the Constitution (Basic Law) of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova by violating the position of Articles 1, 4, 68, 70, 71, 80, 97, 125, and 127; and that it adopts illegal rulings directed at undermining the state and social order of the republic and violating its territorial integrity, on the basis of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium edict of 25 August 1989 entitled "On a Provisional Procedure for Registering Public Association of Citizens in the SSR of Moldova" the Government of the SSR of Moldova decrees:

1. To disband the People's Movement "Gagauz Khalky."

2. To repeal the 26 October 1989 decree of the SSR of Moldova Council of Ministers entitled "On the Registration of the Rules of the People's Movement 'Gagauz Khalky.'"

[Signed] M. Drunk, prime minister of the SSR of Moldova

[Dated] Kishinev, 22 August 1990

Decries Leaders' 'Dilettantism'

90UN2802B Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 31 Aug 90 p 1

["Decree of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium on the Causes for the Aggravation of the Sociopolitical Situation and of Interethnic Relations in the Republic"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova notes that after the end of the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the SSR of Moldova, destructive forces became more active in the republic and are undertaking actions that are reprehensible from moral, ethical, political, and legal points of view with the goal of halting the process of perestroyka in all spheres of the life of the republic.

By their declarations on the creation of an autonomy, the "leaders" of the Gagauz and of the residents of the Dnestr region have aggravated the social and political situation and interethnic relations and have given rise to two mutually connected seats of tension. In both instances political ambitions, dilettantism, and political irresponsibility of the instigators are in evidence, and with the goal of accumulating political capital and broadening the circle of adherents through their coordinated actions the instigators stir up the situation and, gambling with ethnic sentiment, encroach upon the territorial integrity of the republic.

A detailed analysis of the circumstances which led up to the organization and realization of the so-called First Congress of People's Deputies of all levels from territories densely populated by Gagauz has shown that the illegal, antistate activities of a group of political adventurers, including a number of people's deputies of the SSR of Moldova from Bendery, Rybnitsa, and Tiraspol, was the main factor which influenced the outcome of the congress and its adoption of antistate rulings. These "figures" are also known as the organizers of the strikes which were conducted last autumn and as the organizers of referendums directed against the state symbols and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the SSR of Moldova. At present these same adventurers are preparing for a second congress of deputies of all levels from the Dnestr region which is supposed to be conducted during the first 10 days of September and will decide the question of a Pridnestr ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

Viewing the goals and proposed agenda of the upcoming second congress of deputies of all levels from the rayons near the Dnestr as a provocation and an anticonstitutional action directed at a new aggravation of the social and political situation in the republic, the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees:

To warn the organizers and possible participants in the congress that they will bear legal and political responsibility before all the people of the republic for possible negative consequences in the event that deliberately anticonstitutional rulings are adopted.

[Signed] M. Snegur, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the SSR of Moldova

[Dated] 30 August 1990, Kishinev

'Thousands' of Ukrainians Protest Treaty Signing

LD1809091890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 18 Sep 90

[Text] Many thousands met Sunday [16 September] in Kiev to protest the concluding of a new union treaty signed by the Ukraine. The INTERFAX agency reports those who assembled on October Revolution Square demanded the immediate return of Ukrainian young men from the ranks of the Soviet Army and insisted upon the resignation of the Soviet Government. Participants in the action also called for the resignation of Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Kravchuk and the republican government.

The meeting adopted a resolution condemning the possible signing of a Union treaty by the Ukraine.

Ukrainian Liberal Democratic Party Organized

LD1709181490 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1945 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Excerpts] The Liberal-Democratic Party of Ukraine [LDPU] is being organized in the republic. Our correspondent, Serhiy Karatayskyy, met with Oleksiy Tovpyh, member of the organizing commitee.

[Begin recording] [Karatayskyy] Could you briefly define the main idea of liberalism?

[Tovpyh] It places priority on human values, to be precise on the values of the individual. [passage omitted]

[Karatayskyy] Is there a distinct separation between you, social democrats, and constitutional democrats?

[Tovpyh] Yes. Constitutional Democrats or Kadets closely watch all constitutional issues. Social Democrats accentuate the protection of working people's interests and social guarantees for all citizens. We advocate all three notions, placing emphasis on one or another point, depending on the situation.

[Karatayskyy] Is it right that you are not keen on a coaliation with Russian Kadets because historically this party always represented the great power idea?

[Tovpyh] Everything will depend on whether the Kadets continue insisting on this idea.

[Karatayskyy] Do you already have a membership, branches?

[Tovpyh] Yes. Branches already exist in Kiev, Nikopol, and in other locations. We are in close contact with other towns where members are preparing for a constituent congress planned for mid-October. [passage omitted]

[Karatayskyy] On which political and social groups and forces do your hopes lie?

[Tovpyh] We believe that a considerable part of the intelligentsia will join the party. And again, since we advocate privatization and business, naturally we expect to be popular among property owners and hope that they will support us financially. [passage omitted]

We already publish two newspapers—Liberal and [name indistinct]. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Ukraine Housing Shortage Boosts Social Tension

LD1709162990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1038 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Vladimir Yurkevich]

[Text] Donetsk, 17 Sep (UKRINFORM-TASS)—The miners of the Donbass (Ukraine) have once again sounded the alarm. This time their concern has been caused by the failure of the housing program envisaged for the current year. It has already become clear that there will be a shortfall of many hundreds of apartments for the miners and their families. Along with poor provisioning of foodstuffs and industrial goods, the shortage in housing has increased social tension in the mining area still further.

"The situation could not be worse," said Sergey Mishin, a union leader, commenting upon the situation that has developed at one of the pits. "Of the 3,500 square meters planned, just over 700 have been allocated. And that is when we have about 1,300 workers and staff in need of housing, almost one in four working at the mine."

The picture is the same regarding the provision of housing at other Donetsk mines. All in all, more than 24,000 square meters have not been provided over the last two years to the Donetskugol Production Association which numbers 21 mines.

"One of the main demands of the miners on strike was the housing issue," I was told by Aleksandr Kolomiytsev, co-chairman of the Donetsk city workers' (strike) committee. "And this was registered in the USSR Council of Ministers decision after the summer strikes last year; however, to a large extent it has remained purely on paper. The government of the country recently adopted a new decision under which it is planned to build 1.439 million square meters of housing in Donetsk in 1991-1995. This veiled change of time is not to the miners' liking. For this reason we demand that the government of the country and the local authorities pay their debt in housing, which they have accumulated in recent years, before 1992 and bring order to the construction industry of the mining area."

Caucasus

Armenian Leader Meets Azerbaijan's Mutalibov

LD1509085990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Report by ARMENPRES-TASS correspondent Gagik Melkumyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 14 Sep (ARMENPRES-TASS)—Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian parliament, recently held a conversation with Ayaz Mutalibov, president of Azerbaijan, it was reported by Babken Araktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, speaking here on television. He clarified that this conversation was of a general political nature and did not touch on the blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh by Azerbaijan.

Babken Araktsyan stated that "the unobjective and one-sided coverage of events in the region, of relations between these two republics, and also in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast by the country's central mass media evokes serious concern in Armenia. He also commented on the need for fundamental restructuring in the work of the mass media in Armenia itself, stressing, in this regard, the importance of setting up a daily newspaper of the Supreme Soviet, REPUBLIKA ARMENIYA, in the Armenian and Russian languages. The deputy head of parliament also feels that it is necessary to do everything possible to ensure that representatives of the foreign press, including press bodies of the Armenian diaspora outside the USSR, should have the opportunity to acquaint themselves more extensively and more profoundly with the situation in Armenia.

Speaking of the prospects for economic and other ties between Armenia and the authorities of the Soviet Union, Babken Araktsyan commented that these ties will be preserved and will develop on a mutually beneficial basis, especially since the country is preparing to switch to a market economy.

Ter-Petrosyan: People Back Disarming of Gunmen

LD1609100890 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 16 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—"Not a single legal government can put up with illegally armed people," today's KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper quotes the words by President of the Armenian Parliament Ter-Petrosyan, referring to the GOLOS ARMENII newspaper.

It is not the republican government's aim to incorporate the Armenian National Army (ANA) into state structures. Ter-Petrosyan noted that the people support the disarmament of gunmen.

According to the president, the former government put up with armed detachments, since it was interested in instability.

The "indpendence" detachment was recently disarmed (true, there were casualties). Three ANA groups numbering 100 were disbanded in Ararat District.

Nevertheless, according to information from the headquarters of the Transcaucasian Military District, weapons by-pass army depots as before, although appropriate law enforcement bodies had received lists of automatic arms numbers long ago.

Gunmen fired on a frontier post in the community of Karaveler, Kazakh district in Azerbaijan, on the night of September 11, wounding a sergeant. The next night fire was opened on a military depot of communications equipment in Yerevan's north-eastern suburb.

Armenian Interior Minister Assails PRAVDA

NC1509114290 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 14 Sep 90

[Letter by Armenian Internal Affairs Minister K.B. Kazaryan to the editorial collegium of PRAVDA]

[Text] Yerevan, 14 Sep (ARMENPRES)—In its 13 September issue PRAVDA published a TASS report entitled "Shots Continue."

It is difficult to know what motivated the anonymous author in compiling that report. However, it is certain that distorted information has again slipped into the pages of the paper.

We hereby report that on 10 September the operational team of the internal affairs ministry and of the committee for state security conducted a special operation in Araratskiy Rayon—and not in Artashatskiy Rayon as was reported in the paper—to neutralize a group of criminals who resisted arrest. During the countermeasures to thwart the gang, its leader was killed. He had been in court four times on charges of having committed grave crimes and was released from detention last April. Let us agree that there is a difference between a criminal and the armed resistance of "terrorists who use weapons almost daily." The latter openly implies the political and interethnic nature of such acts.

An inexperienced reader would find it difficult to understand the true facts from the above information. Instead of being made aware of the increasingly active struggle against various crimes, he is left with a definitely biased view about the situation in the republic.

What is suspicious is that the author is unwilling to present objective and complete information.

At its end, the article expresses regret on the minimal quantity of returned weapons. The author has been unwilling or unable to observe the main fact: Under the extremely complex and extraordinary situation prevailing in the republic the Supreme Soviet is taking resolute measures to normalize the situation and the republic's population shows understanding toward and supports these measures.

The organs of the internal affairs ministry are increasingly active against criminal activity, resulting in a decline in the number of reported crimes.

A complex but irreversible process toward the stabilization of the situation is taking place in the republic and the republic's authorities are in full control of the situation.

Such unscrupulous information disseminated by TASS confuses PRAVDA's readership. Moreover such information sent abroad in the name of TASS discredits the policy and the conduct of the democratic government of Armenia in the eyes of the international public. All these create a bitter feeling of social and legal defenselessness among the population of the republic. These have an extremely negative effect on the situation in Armenia and greatly reduce the productiveness of our efforts to stabilize the situation in the republic and in the entire region.

I hope that henceforth the editorial collegium of PRAVDA will not allow the publication of information that distort the facts. [Signed] K.B. Kazaryan, minister of internal affairs of Armenia

Yerevan Curfew Reduced; Crimes Down 'Markedly'

LD1509114690 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Text] Yerevan September 15 ARMENPRES-TASS—The curfew in the Armenian capital of Yerevan has been reduced by two hours.

The republican Interior Minister K. Kazaryan said that "since the time a state of emergency was imposed in Armenia, the number of crimes, particularly grave crimes with the use of weapons, has markedly dwindled."

"No aggravation of the sitaution on ethnic grounds has been registered, although there have been some conflicts on pastures near the border with Azerbaijan," Kazaryan said.

Interior Ministry Reports Situation 'Quiet'

LD1709183390 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 17 Sep 90

[By ARMENPRES-TASS correspondents Gagik Galustian and Gagik Melkumian]

[Text] Yerevan, 17 September TASS—According to the Armenian Interior Ministry, the situation in the republic has been quiet in the past few days and additional measures have been taken to quicken the pace of the implementation of the parliament decree on the state of emergency.

The republican mass media broadcast today the texts of appeals by Catholicos Vazgen the I of all Armenians to the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and by Nagorno-Karabakh to USSR people's deputies.

In his appeal to the Soviet president, the Catholicos calls for saving the lives of Academician Viktor Ambartsumyan, writer Zoriy Balayan, and actor Sos Sarkisyan who have declared a hunger strike to protest against the liquidation of Soviet power in Nagorno-Karabakh and the illegal activity by the Azerbaijani authorities aimed at the liquidation of the region's autonomy.

The Catholicos sent a telegram to the three hunger strikers expressing his admiration of their heroic deed symbolising the voice of national conscience.

Russian builders working in the earthquake-hit zone sent a telegram to Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan and Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev today. They expressed their desire to continue work to help rebuild population centres devastated by the earthquake.

They note that thanks to the new republican government's activity, the situation has considerably improved and conditions were right for normal work.

Coverage Continues on Nagorno-Karabakh Situation

Troop Interference Decried

NC1409120590 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 13 Sep 90

[Text] The chairmen of the executive committees of the oblast, city, and rayon soviets of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the USSR people's deputies from NKAO have sent an open letter to V. Bakatin, a member of the USSR Presidential Council and USSR minister of internal affairs. The letter points out that the numerous assurances given by V. Bakatin to the effect that the Internal Troops would not interfere in the solution of political and economic problems are not borne out by the facts. Rather, the commandant's office handling the state of emergency and the Internal Troop detachment serving under it is still engaged in tendentious activities in the Armenian inhabited regions of NKAO and of Azerbaijan.

The Internal Troop subunits deployed in Azerbaijani regions together with the armed Azerbaijanis dressed as militiamen are carrying out frequent searches in the Armenian villages and in the process are committing atrocities and hurting the national and human dignity of the Armenians.

The Internal Troops—which in the absence of the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission operate under the command of the so-called Republican Organizational Committee—in the region interfere not only in politics but also in economic, administrative and demographic issues.

The commandant of the state of emergency region always (?displays) an enviable activity when it comes to conducting hundreds of passenger and freight cars through the Armenian inhabited areas to the Azerbaijani areas. Yet, at the same time for a year it refused to accompany the vehicles carrying freight to NKAO from Gorisskiy Rayon which is so close to NKAO. Already for more than one week now the railway is under regular blockade. The supply of foodstuffs and manufactured goods to NKAO has ceased. The fuel stocks have been depleted completely. The drinking water pumped into Stepanakert is regularly being poisoned and the communications and power lines are being cut. Most of these actions undermine the security of the Armenian population of NKAO and directly threaten their life. One would have hoped that the commandant's office with the assistance of the Internal Troops would have prevented such incidents. Alas, it takes no measure in that direction.

In actively assisting the widespread illegal construction work in the Azerbaijani settlements, the Internal Troops have become the executers of the will of the Azerbaijani leadership which aspires to alter the ethnic composition of the NKAO. These same troops create obstacles to the meager amount of construction work [done by the Armenians] under present blockade conditions existing in the oblast. In so doing, they are preventing the refugees from Azerbaijan to settle.

The letter also points out that the military commandant's office has illegally taken over the functions of the local state and administrative organs, and inconsiderately interferes in the economic activities of NKAO enterprises and organizations and creates impediments to their normal operation.

The Internal Troops have become more active in implementing the plans to remove the soviet and party organs in the NKAO rayons. The ultimate aim of these plans is to dissolve these organs. Lately such an attempt was made in Martuninskiy and Askeranskiy Rayons without any result. However, the mechanized subunits of the Internal Troops which had been deployed outside the borders of NKAO moved on the night of 11 September and occupied with armed force the building of the party rayon committee and party rayon executive committee at Askeran town.

The authors of the letter then noted that though a number of commandants succeeded each other in NKAO during the entire course of incidents, the activities of the commandant's office have nevertheless not improved. The mutual understanding and the goodwill between the Internal Troops and the population has given way to tense relations.

The authors in appealing to Bakatin want the minister, this member of the Presidential Council, to immediately clarify the question of why the Internal Troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry deployed in NKAO are not doing what has been devolved on them by the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They also want him to solve the issue of their more appropriate deployment.

Protest in Martuninskiy Rayon

NC1609084290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 15 Sep 90

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent Aleksandr Grigoryan on the situation in Artsakh (Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast—NKAO) on 15 September]

[Text] Will the voice of reason and justice ever be heard? Today this fateful question perturbs each person in Artsakh who wages a worthy struggle against the conservative forces which are determined to utilize all means available to them to suppress the national liberation struggle of the Armenians in NKAO.

The collectives of the enterprises, organizations, and institutions of the autonomous oblast are sending cables to Moscow expressing their profound thanks to their elected representatives who have resorted to such an extreme measure to defend the interests of their compatriots. The people of Artsakh are at the same time worried about the health of the deputies on hunger strike for their lives are a matter of concern for the entire Armenian people.

In the meantime, the tension in Artsakh is not abating. On the night of 14-15 September a powerful explosion occurred place at the local radio studio in Stepanakert. Fortunately, there were no casualties. This unfortunate incident raises suspicions because for the last few months this very important building in the autonomous oblast is being kept under strict control of the military. The causes of the explosion are being investigated.

According to the available information, a large crowd—one thousand or may be more in number—have again gathered near the Martuninskiy Rayon party committee building today at around 1100. They demanded that the building under troop control be returned to the legally elected rayon party committee. The people of Mardakertskiy—the largest rayon in NKAO—fear that the troops might take a similar measure in their rayon. To prevent this from happening, the party and soviet staff are guarding the Mardakertskiy Rayon party committee building round the clock.

There is no substantial change in the situation in Askeranskiy and Gadrutskiy Rayons.

For the last two days the oblast has had no telephone connections with Armenia and Moscow. The local radio transmits Moscow radio programs only and the Armenian population is unable to receive broadcasts in Armenian.

Oleg Yesayan, first secretary of Martuninskiy Rayon party committee, told the ARMENPRES correspondent that he together with Vilen Kocharyan, first secretary of Askeranskiy Rayon party committee, and Grigor Bagyan, first secretary of Gadrutskiy Rayon party committee, have been called to the office of (?Mazuskin), the military procurator at the Stepanakert garrison. They were told that they are the main culprits behind the destabilization of the situation in the three rayons. They were warned that unless they leave the state of emergency region within the coming four or five days they will be called to account.

Oleg Yesayan, Vilen Kocharyan, and Grigor Bagyan have sent cables to Gorbachev, the president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Sukharev, USSR procurator general, and to Bakatin, USSR internal affairs minister. These cables carried a firm protest against the illegal activities of the military procurator the aim of which is to discredit the leaders of the rayon party organizations legally elected by the Communists. The cables call for appropriate investigation into these activities which cannot but be described as blackmail.

One wonders what new plots the big powers of this world will be hatching against Nagorno-Karabakh tomorrow.

Armenian Soviet Issues Appeal

LD1709173890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] The Armenian Supreme Soviet has appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet session, supreme soviets of the Union republics, parliaments throughout the world, and the UN Commission on Human Rights to speak up in defense of representatives of the Armenian people and the rightful demands of the Nagorno-Karabakh people. Domestic political, economic, cultural, and ethnographic tasks of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] are being tackled at present exclusively with the help of weapons, the appeal notes. Since January 1989 the oblast soviet has been abolished and, alongside the talk about handing power over to soviets, troops are being used to eliminate local government bodies in the NKAO. The appeal states that USSR People's Deputies Balayan, Ambartsumyan, Sarkisyan, and Grygoryan have gone on a hunger strike in Moscow. This action, the appeal states, is in condemnation of the political game being played by certain authorities. Believing that other forms of democratic struggle have not been exhausted, the Armenian Supreme Soviet has appealed to the USSR deputies to cease their hunger strike.

Crowd Ransacks KGB Headquarters in Tbilisi

PM1709210190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent L. Arshantsev: "Pogrom in KGB Building"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Pieces of broken glass, smashed tables, burnt portraits of political figures, broken bas-reliefs, and piles of official documents lying in the road... The Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB building on Lesi Ukrainki Street currently looks like a beach house after a tidal wave has hit.

On the night of 16-17 September an excited crowd stormed the first and second floors and carried out a veritable pogrom in the offices of the investigations department. Some documents were stolen from hidden safes.

This, so to speak, was the culmination. The prelude to the event was the rally held at the National Stadium Sunday evening. An emotional speech was made at it by Z. Gamsakhurdia, leader of the "Roundtable" party, who announced the creation of the "Free Georgia" electoral bloc of parties. The program provisions of this new organization need no commentary: to declare Soviet power in Georgia illegal, to exclude Communists from parliament, to declare Georgia independent, and to rename it the Georgian republic.

Moreover, it is planned to elaborate a number of highly important laws—above all, laws on ownership, military service, national military formations, and land. As has been promised, the electoral bloc's program will soon be published in the press.

If the rally itself was held within the parliamentary framework, the subsequent action taken by activists from the "Saint Ilya the Upright" Society were quite a different story. The formal pretext for the storming of the KGB building was to free one of that political organization's arrested activists.

The question "just what was the militia doing?" is quite appropriate in this instance. The local law-enforcement organs have adopted an obvious policy of noninterference. I saw that the entrance to Ministry of Internal Affairs—which is next door to the KGB building—had been boarded up.

One thing is clear: The nearer we get to the elections to the Georgian Supreme Soviet, the tenser the situtiop in the republic's capital is becoming.

Significance of Georgian Elections Pondered

LD1609205890 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 16 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow September 16 TASS—Although less than a month and a half are left before the October 28 general elections in Georgia, one of the three Soviet transcaucasian republics, the political line up in the republic is so confusing as to exclude the identification of leaders in the pre-election race.

According to the latest information, the Central Electoral Commission has already registered 35 political parties and public organisations willing to test themselves in the elections.

These are going to be the first-ever multi-party elections in Georgia to be held in keeping with the mixed majority-proportional system.

This means that half of the 250 seats will be filled by deputies elected in mandatory constituencies and the other half by people selected from all-Georgia party lists on the basis of equal representation.

Elections are expected to provide an answer to the chief question—will Georgia follow in the steps of the Baltic republics and seek secession from the union or sign a union treaty after declaring its state sovereignty?

Champions of the first option belong to a number of major opposition movements, including the Society of Elijah the Righteous and the Popular Front.

These organisations are mostly radical judging by their policy statements and the forms and methods they employ in their election campaign.

The leader of the Society of Elijah the Righteous, one of the most popular oppositon figures, Zviad Gamsakhurdia has described the new Union treaty, now under preparation in the Soviet Union, as "another form of enslavement of the Georgian people."

He advocates disbanding the Republican Communist Party and refuses to talk with movements which are not prepared to unconditionally support his strategy.

It is for this apparent reason that some opposition members call for preventing Gamsakhurdia from taking office, as they view him as a possible new dictator for Georgia.

A more constructive position is taken by the national Reconciliation and Georgian Renaissance Union, the Progressive Democratic Party and the Labour Party.

They favour the consolidation of all political forces aiming to build a truly democratic society in the republic.

The Georgian Communist Party supports this drive. Its central committee recently called for holding a meeting on a party basis of representatives of all political parties and socio-political organisations running in the elections.

In their appeal, communists propose working out and adopting at this meeting a joint statement pledging that, irrespective of their differing party-political, social, economic and other views, all parties will facilitate democratic pre-election campaign and elections and be guided by the republic's supreme interests.

The leader of Georgian Communists, Givi Gumbaridze, said in an interview with a Moscow newspaper that the most important condition for pulling the republic out of the crisis was a civil and national accord and the consolidation of society.

According to political observers, the fate of Georgia and its people will depend on whether the champions of this policy will manage to overcome their differences and act in concert.

Central Asia

Tajikistan Tension 'Shows No Signs of Abating'

PM1709155190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 90 p 2

[Article by U. Babakhanov under the rubric: "Nationalities Question": "All Is Calm in Tajikistan..."]

[Text] Dushanbe—Dushanbe is suffering its customary heat and usual all-pervasive dust. Life takes its course.

Nothing seemingly reminds one of the state of emergency that has operated in the city for six months now. Except perhaps the deserted streets at night.

"The situation is stabilizing" and "the situation is under control" are the usual phrases which issue from various rostrums.

There are indeed no guns going off or bombs exploding in Dushanbe. But for some reason anxiety shows no sign of abating: The lull before the storm? The monolithic, unified "new community" has cracked and split into two camps— the "indigenous" and the "Russian-speaking."

The rent dividing people over "Paragraph Five" emerged clearly in the spring and summer of last year, when the republic discussed the Law on Language. Tajik newspapers formed a united front advocating state status for the Tajik language. Timid doubts concerning the advisability of such a step were voiced in the republic's Russian periodicals.

Two monologues do not yet constitute a dialogue.... The first chance to listen to and understand each other was lost.

Exactly one month later the republic Supreme Soviet adopted the long-awaited law to the accompaniment of a standing ovation : "The Tajik language (Farsi) is the state Language of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]... the Russian language, as the language of interethnic communication among the peoples of the USSR, freely functions on the territory of the Tajik SSR."

In adopting the law the republic took its first step toward sovereignty. Many people in Tajikistan pinned their hopes of national revival and spiritual and economic progress upon it. And amidst the general rejoicing few people noticed the unspoken question in the eyes of the "nonindigenous citizens": But what awaits me and my children in the new, sovereign Tajikistan?

Six months passed. February erupted onto the scene.

The name of the last winter month is now charged with significance in the republic. But different people give different meaning to it. For some it was a phenomenon organized by "Islamic extremists," for others a spontaneous revolt by the desperate rural lumpen, while others saw it as an attempt at a palace coup or struggle among clans. Whatever the assessment of the tragedy, it showed once again that the society is seriously sick and in need of intensive therapy.

There are around 650,000 unemployed in the five-million-strong republic. Most live in villages. Some 65.1 percent of the whole population live below the poverty line. The bulk of the deprived also live in rural localities. Some 97 percent of all women in the countryside suffer from various illnesses. Sick women give birth to a sick nation....

While these dreadful figures persist society cannot be immune to new outbreaks. And each time they will acquire an ethnic hue, if only because the overwhelming majority of this hapless rural population are Tajiks.

...I saw people carrying many placards on the square during those days in February. Their content varied, but they were alike in one respect. It was patently obvious that they had been hurriedly put together on the street from whatever was to hand. One slogan, however, which appeared on a roof opposite the republic Communist Party Central Committee building on the third day stood out sharply from this "makeshift amateurishness." "Tajikistan for Tajik-Speakers" had been inscribed in well-formed letters by a professional hand on a regular red calico banner.

Be that as it may, blood was shed.

People have been leaving the republic. Construction workers, doctors, teachers, railroad workers, engineers, and aviators. According to the figures of the Tajik State Committee for Statistics, 26,279 people left the republic in the first half of this year. Some people in Tajikistan claim: "It is untrue that representatives of the nonindigenous nationality are leaving because of the Law on Language and the February events! They are simply seeking cushier jobs..."

Sociological research recently carried out among those wishing to leave the republic allows the discussion to be made more objective. The following were cited as reasons prompting such a decision: the change in the family's position (4.5 percent), deterioration in the material conditions of life (10.5 percent), fear of a recurrence of the events of February (20.2 percent), the change in the linguistic situation (11.6 percent), the unsuitable climate (8.4 percent), and so forth.

It would, of course, be a mistake to reduce everything to one or two causes. Complex, often ambiguous processes are under way in the republic, many of which cannot be regarded outside the historical context and outside what is happening in the country, the Asian region, and in the world. But it is also clear—and the poll shows this—that a sizeable number of people are being driven out of the republic by anxiety and uncertainty about the future, which cannot be imputed to geopolitics.

However, alongside the as yet still rare attempts to calm people, other opinions are heard. "Everyone who opposes the implementation of the Law on Language is an enemy of the Tajik nation, an enemy of the Tajik state!" Will we soon hear the familiar "enemy of the people"?

The Tajik intelligentsia's logic is irreproachable and people's aspirations understandable: Is it just that the language of the people which gave its name to the republic should not have become the language of official court proceeding in all the 70 years of Soviet power? Is it normal that the ancient literary Tajik language—the language of Omar Khayyam, Firdausi, Rudagi, and Sa'di—should be relegated to the level of everyday communication?

Yes, everything is logical and people's motives are understandable. It is a good thing when a doctor can communicate with his patients in their native language. That's normal. And must be striven for. But matters are reaching the point where the question may be put differently: A doctor, even if he does not know the state language—or no doctor at all? Is my language my enemy?

It is often asked why the democratic movement is so weak in Tajikistan. Does therein lie the "secret of eternal youth" of the command and administrative structures? The causes are diverse, but I am sure that the inability and reluctance of people of different nationalities to take a step toward each other is not the least of them.

...I recently attended a meeting held in a remote village between a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress and the population. Girls aged 12 to 14, their faces like those of old women, sorched by the sun from working in the kolkhoz [collective farm] fields listened with eyes timidly lowered to an account by the visiting guest of the impressive successes recently achieved by Soviet Tajikistan and how marvellously ordinary working people live today.

"But all the multiparty system and market economics trumpeted there in Moscow do not suit our republic. All that does you and me nothing but harm!—was how the delegate concluded his speech.

"So what are we to do then?—asked an old team-leader sheepishly.

"Write collective letters and collect signatures. Protest!"

Outwardly everything is calm in Takjikistan....

Ashkhabad Transport Militia Staffers on Strike

PM1709132690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by V. Kuleshov: "Militia Protest"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—Nearly the entire personnel of the Ashkhabad station internal affairs transport department has withdrawn its labor. It is chiefly a protest against tyranny, extortion, and bribery on the part of the internal affairs administration leadership in the transport sphere.

"Perestroyka is abroad, democracy and glasnost are developing, and human values are taking pride of place; but with us everything is as it was before, everything remains the same: No one treats us as human beings, no one takes any notice of our decisions, the opinion of the collective...," the international affairs transport administration personnel wrote in a collective letter they brought to the republican Communist Party Central Committee. The militia personnel's just demands were set out clearly, point by point. The main ones are that the leaders involved in bribery should be removed from the transport militia administration, privates and sergeants should be given real security, and militia offciers working in the transport sphere should get a pay raise.

"What prompted the demands?" I asked the militia officers who had gone to the Central Committee.

"We are tired of the tyrannical behavior," Sergeant A. Myatiyev said. "Of the injustices perpetrated by the leadership. We recently set up our own militia collective council, comprising honest, worthy people, and we decided to dismiss one staffer for drinking alcohol on duty. But the administration leadership, in the shape of Colonel A. Kocheryagin, took no notice of our decision: The dismissed officer was taken on by the administration apparatus. But what about the chicanery involving vehicles earmarked for sale to the best officers in our collective?! The department received three cars. Including a Volga, which our council decided to give to an Afghan war veteran. But we never clapped eyes on the Volga: B. Akmamedov, A. Kocheryagin's deputy for economic matters, snapped it up and then sold it to someone outside. All three vehicles went the same way.

A special team has been set up at the republic's Internal Affairs Ministry to check this statement out.

Kazakhstan Recognizes 6 Oct as Republic Day

LD1709181190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Sep 90

[Text] Here is the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on the proclamation of Republic Day. Taking into consideration the aspirations of the people of Kazakhstan for sovereignty and the historical importance of the adoption of the declaration on the rights of the workers of Kazakhstan of 6 October 1920, which was the first constitutional act proclaiming the formation of the national state system, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh SSR has decided to recognize 6 October as Republic Day, to mark it every year as a state and public holiday in Kazakhstan, and to put forward the current decision for the approval of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh SSR.